

Rethinking Coercive Diplomacy

A Dynamic Approach to NATO Coercive Diplomacy in Bosnia and Kosovo

Henning Køhler Knutsen



Master Thesis, Department of Political Science
Faculty of Social Sciences

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Spring 2012

Rethinking Coercive Diplomacy

A Dynamic Approach to NATO Coercive Diplomacy in Bosnia and Kosovo

Henning K hler Knutsen

© Henning Køhler Knutsen

2012

Rethinking Coercive Diplomacy: A Dynamic Approach to NATO Coercive Diplomacy in
Bosnia and Kosovo

Henning Køhler Knutsen

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Print: Reprosentralen, University of Oslo

Abstract

After the Cold War, with the advent of low-interest, “optional”, post-modern warfare, regional conflicts and failed states have illuminated the radars in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization member states. For these countries, as the expected need for military force relinquished, its actual use increased. Left with a need for improved tools for handling the increasing number of international security issues, the strategy of coercive diplomacy has never been of more current interest. This thesis seeks to address a lacuna in contemporary theorizing about coercive diplomacy, namely the under-theorization of *the adversary*. Through within-case and cross-case analysis of the NATO interventions in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo, I attempt to show how both scientists and political decision-makers can benefit from a more in-depth analysis of the coerced.

The thesis takes the theoretical framework developed by Bruce Jentleson and Christopher Whytock as a starting point. As a significant step in the right direction, their model of coercive diplomacy better accounts for the motivations, interests, and expected reactions of the target state. Furthermore, I seek to congruence test the theory’s predictions against the historical outcomes of NATO’s coercive diplomatic attempts. The results indicate that the framework delivers generally correct predictions, and that further theoretical development in this direction is warranted.

Word Count: 40,788

Acknowledgments

The final product which has become my master thesis could not have been realized without the valuable help of a number of people. Each contributing to my project in their own way, I am very grateful for their assistance. Any remaining mistakes are mine alone.

Firstly, I would like to thank my thesis advisor at the University of Oslo, Professor Janne Haaland Matlary. Her experience, professional insight, and constructive feedback have helped shape and review my thesis.

Furthermore, I am grateful to the Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies (IFS), who awarded me a generous scholarship and a part in the research programme “NATO in a Changing World”.

Finally, I am in debt to my family in general, and to my wife in particular. Ewelina, your ability to get me through good and frustrating times alike continues to astound me each and every day.

Henning K. Knutsen

Oslo, May 2012

For my wonderful wife;

who provides encouragement like no one else

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Research Theme	1
1.2	Research Question	4
2	Theory	7
2.1	Main Concepts	7
2.2	A Model of Threats.....	10
2.3	Research Status	12
2.3.1	The Pioneers: Schelling, and George and Simons	12
2.3.2	The <i>Ideal Policy</i> : Jakobsen.....	13
2.3.3	Jentleson and Whytock: Knowing your Enemy	15
3	Method	21
3.1	Case Selection.....	21
3.2	Method of Comparison	22
3.3	Operationalization and Classification.....	23
3.3.1	The Dependent Variable.....	24
3.3.2	The Coercer's Strategy	24
3.3.3	Target's Domestic Politics and Economy	25
3.4	Data Collection	26
3.5	Replicability, Validity, and Reliability.....	26
3.6	Generalization.....	27
4	Bosnia-Herzegovina	29
4.1	Sources of Conflict	29
4.2	Elites and Key Actors	30
4.3	NATO Coercive Diplomacy	36
4.3.1	The NATO-WEU Naval Blockade	37
4.3.2	Operation Deny Flight.....	41
4.3.3	The Siege of Sarajevo	45
4.3.4	The Markale Marketplace Massacre	47
4.3.5	Assault at Goražde	49
4.3.6	The Tuzla Shelling	52
4.3.7	Operation Deliberate Force	54

5	Kosovo	61
5.1	Sources of Conflict	61
5.2	Elites and Key Actors	62
5.3	NATO Coercive Diplomacy	64
5.3.1	Operation Determined Falcon	65
5.3.2	The October Agreements	68
5.3.3	The Rambouillet Conference	71
5.3.4	Operation Allied Force	75
6	Conclusion.....	85
6.1	Results	85
6.1.1	The Diverging Sub-Cases.....	88
6.2	Causality	89
6.3	Key Variables	91
6.3.1	Necessary and Sufficient Conditions	91
6.3.2	External Pressure versus Domestic Politics	92
6.4	Mismatching Objectives and Strategies	96
6.5	Explaining Coercive Diplomacy	98
6.6	Final Remarks.....	101
	Bibliography.....	105

List of Tables

Table 4.1: Serbian economy's performance in the early nineties (UN.org).....	38
Table 5.1: Serbian economy's performance in the late nineties (UN.org).....	68
Table 6.1: Main findings of chapters four and five, with expected and actual outcomes.....	86

1 Introduction

It was a whole month into Operation Allied Force before North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) military leadership finally received clearance to strike Yugoslavian President Slobodan Milošević's villa complex at Dobanovci, Belgrade. So far, the attack had been prevented by the Dutch government's adamant opposition. They reasoned that the villa was known to host a painting by Rembrandt, to which General Klaus Naumann (cited in Lambeth 2001: 36) exasperated: "*It isn't a good Rembrandt*".

"*When the Russians play chess, what does the West play?*" Professor Janne Haaland Matlary (Minervanett.no) asks rhetorically in a student quarterly. She argues that after 1990, Western policy-makers have largely unlearned the art of strategy. As a typical example of a low-interest conflict, Operation Allied Force illustrated how the more traditional, "hard" principles of strategy have become replaced by "softer" values and norms. When liberal democracies use military might today, they tend to do so in a restricted fashion, where the adversary's expected reaction to pressure is given less priority over other merits.

1.1 Research Theme

The international security environment has changed since the end of the Cold War. As the West's military dominance became clear, Western countries have been drawn away from traditional, perhaps even existential, wars of major or vital interests, and towards more "optional", low-interest conflicts. Formerly repressed or neglected regional conflict, as well as failed states and civil wars demand international attention and involvement. As Western societies have grown more risk-averse, they no longer seek to "resolve" or "eliminate" such threats, but to "manage risks" through "crisis management". For these countries, "brute force", in Thomas Schelling's (1976) terms, has often become outdated, while limited military means are the preferred tool. Ironically, while their motivation for using force thus decreased, the threshold for its actual use was also lowered. In other words, while the expected necessity of using military force turned historically low, its actual use increased proportionally (Henriksen 2007: 57-58). Western countries tend to use limited military means in the defense of values, norms, and the international order. The use, or threat of use, of such limited force to influence the actions of a voluntary actor is known as coercion, and is the primary way in which contemporary, liberal democracies use their military might (de Wijk 2005: 11).

Coercion includes non-military means as well, with the most notable instruments being economic and diplomatic in nature (Henriksen 2007: 58). Furthermore, most coercive approaches fall within one or more of five categories; risk, punishment, denial, decapitation, or incapacitation. While these will not be assessed systematically here, they remain useful concepts to consider when reading the thesis. Next, coercion can be subdivided into coercive diplomacy and military coercion (see section 2.1). While the latter strategy is suitable when vital interests are involved for either party, the former is preferred when they are not (de Wijk 2005: 106). Coercive diplomacy, by combining diplomacy with limited force, promises a way to manage the numerous, new security issues without having to resort to full-scale war, with its high levels of casualties and costs. Furthermore, the strategy is often considered less likely to uncontrolledly escalate, or to permanently damage a post-conflict relationship. For these reasons, coercive diplomacy has often become a “default” option for Western decision-makers, especially when political restrictions exclude other alternatives (George 1994: 9-10). This is interesting because studies show that more often than not, coercive diplomacy fails to produce the desired outcome (Jakobsen 2007: 245). Furthermore, when it fails, it demands difficult choices of the coercer (George 2003: xii). As a main tool in contemporary, liberal democracies’ foreign policy, and yet so inherently hard to master, coercive diplomacy is worth further investigation.

Whereas Cold War theorizing produced a highly developed literature on deterrence, the study of coercive diplomacy is characterized by only a handful of major studies (Jakobsen 2007: 229-230). According to Rob de Wijk (2005: 15), “[a] *credible theory of coercion or coercive diplomacy is still lacking*”, whereas Adrian Hyde-Price (2004) claims that: “[t]he *lack of a clear doctrinal basis for crisis response operations involving a combination of diplomacy and coercion is evidence of a major lacuna in strategic thinking which is the legacy of the cold war*”. The area with perhaps the most immediate need for further study could be the intellectual conception of *the adversary*. de Wijk (2005: 20), amongst others, has noted that the adversary has often been neglected as a meaningful unit of analysis. According to his argument, neither Western intellectuals nor political leaders have sufficiently taken into account the opponent’s interests and motivations in coercive interactions. This could stem from factors like overconfidence in the West’s superior military situation, or the political need to demonize one’s opponent (de Wijk 2005: 107).

Regardless, a successful strategy of coercive diplomacy requires accounting for the mix of motivations, interests, and expected reactions of the adversary. In other words, both the

practice of, and theorizing about, coercive diplomacy needs a reintegration with a *strategic essence*, i.e. an interactive element between coercer and coerced. This is what de Wijk (2005: 16) has called the need for a *dynamic* approach. While contemporary theories have developed sophisticated tools for evaluating the coercer's strategy, the adversary is often at best superficially conceptualized through an asymmetrical balance of motivation, and at worst as an inanimate object to be acted upon. Moving beyond this superficial image to address underlying causes of motivational asymmetries, it not only becomes possible to analyze the coerced's expected reaction to external pressure, but also to do so with fewer assumptions about the adversary.

A second implication of the trend towards "optional" wars and limited responses entails that the smaller the interests at stake, the "more optional", and the less domestic support, for participation. "*The security dynamics of the EU, such as those of NATO, concern the offset of domestic constraints and interests between the national and international levels. Governments need multilateral support and risk/cost-sharing for optional wars...*" Matlary (2009: 2) writes. Furthermore, coalitional organization enhances multilateral diplomatic pressure and legitimacy, without which participation becomes difficult. On the other hand, it also entails dangers of lack of leadership, unity, and resolve (George and Simons 1994: 273). Nevertheless, it is likely that the world's security issues will, in the foreseeable future, continue to be addressed on a multilateral platform. As the only existing institution with an integrated military structure, NATO has often been the organization of choice for Western governments' crisis management (Aybet and Moore 2010: 1). With the Alliance's recent engagement in Libya, and growing concerns over a potentially nuclear Iran, it is clear that NATO will remain a primary engine for Western military cooperation.

Therefore, the aim of this study is to better understand the dynamics and the sources of successes and failures in NATO's attempts at using the strategy of coercive diplomacy as a crisis management tool. In this thesis it is argued, with theoretical support in the approach developed by Bruce Jentleson and Christopher Whytock (2005), that for success in coercive diplomacy, it is necessary for the coercer to maintain a balanced and reciprocal strategy with clear, precise, and limited goals, while at the same time including a deeper and more realistic understanding of the incentives and preferences of the adversary. As demonstrated by more established studies, coercive diplomacy is such a complex phenomenon, involving so many variables, that sweeping generalizations are not warranted. Instead, it is the task of the researcher to find and analyze the most relevant factors, so that situations where the strategy

is feasible and recommendable can be identified (George and Simons 1994: 268-269). Nevertheless, with a strictly defined universe of research objects, some contingent generalizations may be made, allowing some lessons to be learnt for the next time NATO decision-makers consider using coercive diplomacy.

1.2 Research Question

In view of the research theme suggested above, the thesis' research question will be formulated as follows:

In the incidents where NATO and its member governments have used the strategy of coercive diplomacy as a crisis management tool, how can the variance in the outcomes be explained?

This formulation implies a two-leveled discussion. On the first and primarily empirical level, it entails a disciplined configurative approach, wherein notable cases where the NATO governments used coercive diplomacy are examined for heuristic purposes. It will allow us to understand and explain the dynamics of NATO's attempts, and thus bring important knowledge about significant historical events. Furthermore, from this examination it should be possible to extrapolate what factors were the most important in shaping the outcome. This aspect reflects the research theme's discussion of the importance of coercive diplomacy and NATO in contemporary security politics.

On the second and more theoretical level, the research question implies a discussion and evaluation of the most suitable explanation of coercive diplomacy. It asks what theoretical approach is most fruitful for analyzing coercive diplomacy in general, and for NATO's use of the strategy more specifically. This entails an evaluation of competing theories of coercive diplomacy to determine a theoretical framework for the thesis, as well as a theory testing approach for evaluating the chosen theory's utility in explaining the outcomes of NATO's attempts at coercive diplomacy. This aspect reflects the theme's preoccupation with the lapse in contemporary theorizing on coercive diplomacy, and especially with the under-theorization of the coerced.

Case Selection

At the time of formulating the research question, the universe of incidents where NATO and its member governments had used coercive diplomacy as a crisis management tool was quite

small. The range of potential research objects was mainly constituted by two major, historical cases, i.e. the NATO interventions in Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1992-1995, and in Kosovo in 1998-1999. Both have been analyzed in earlier studies, but from different theoretical and methodological perspectives. Their historical significance as disciplined configurative cases is evident in that they constitute the only two major cases where NATO has used coercive diplomacy for crisis management. Additionally, for reasons outlined in section 3.1, in view of the thesis' theoretical framework the two cases can also be considered theory-testing cases, or "tough tests". At least somewhat least-likely cases, the two research objects are located near the limits of what the theoretical framework can be expected to account for. Thus the theory's research status will be strengthened if it can adequately explain the variance in the cases' outcomes. For these reasons, both cases are included in the study, thereby enabling a cross-case research strategy with structured, focused comparison (George and Bennett 2005). By further subdividing the two cases into a series of coercive diplomacy exchanges (see section 3.1), I position my thesis in line with other studies, and add methodologically strengthening, within-case components. Finally, by including all significant research objects within a strictly defined universe, the cases can be considered to have analytical representivity, and some contingent generalizations can be made for a universe of similar potential, future incidents.

Structure and Organization

This first chapter has been dedicated to the presentation and discussion of the thesis' theme and research question. The aim of the study has been established, and two cases have been selected for a comparative case-study. In the proceeding chapter, some theoretical considerations are made. The main concepts are defined, premises and assumptions are discussed, and ultimately an evaluation of coercive diplomacy theories determines the most fruitful theoretical approach for the thesis. The third chapter deals with the methodological framework of the thesis. Here, the case selection process is explained in more detail, and a method of comparison is determined. Additionally, the theoretical variables are clarified and operationalized, before some remarks on data collection, replicability, validity, reliability, and generalizations are made. The fourth and fifth chapters constitute the main case studies of the interventions in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo, respectively. It should be noted that no new empirical data is collected. Rather, existing data is considered in a new perspective. Furthermore, these chapters do not include a full, historical overview of the crises, but only empirical data relevant to the research question. Thus, some knowledge of the general course

of the conflicts is presupposed on behalf of the reader. The final chapter summarizes and discusses the findings of the two case studies, evaluates the level of congruence between the theoretical framework and the historical outcomes, and discusses the key variables in greater depth. Additionally, some considerations are made on causality and mismatching objectives and strategies, before the research question is answered. Ultimately, some final remarks are made on the study's strengths and limitations, in light of other studies of coercive diplomacy.

2 Theory

This chapter will deal with the theoretical perspectives that have been developed in the study of coercive diplomacy. A main goal of this chapter is to determine which of these approaches is best suited for the thesis' research question. In the first section, relevant terms and concepts are presented and defined. Next, section 2.2 shortly discusses a general theory of threats in international politics, including some theoretical requirements and common assumptions. Thirdly, section 2.3 presents the research status in the area of coercive diplomacy, identifying and discussing the main contributions. Finally, this section ends with a presentation of the theoretical framework chosen for this thesis.

2.1 Main Concepts

There is an inherent paradox in writing academically about strategy. In some sense it is not an independent discipline in its own right, rather deriving insights from a series of interrelated fields (Baylis and Wirtz 2007: 5-7). Scientific deliberations have posed questions as to where the subject area should balance between art and science, between history and theory, between military and civil. It is also amongst man's oldest preoccupations. This section will present some of the relevant terms that this ongoing deliberation has included.

First I will consider the overall concept of strategy. In use nearly on a daily basis, the word's meaning has often been adopted and adapted beyond its traditional, military context. For the purpose of this discussion however, a more traditional understanding is assumed. As a starting point, strategy can be considered "*the theory and practice of the use, and threat of use, of organized force for political purposes*" (Gray, cited in Baylis and Wirtz 2007: 4). Nevertheless, this exclusive focus on organized force can be said to downplay other coercive measures, such as diplomatic or economic pressure and inducements (Matlary 2012 [personal communication]). Furthermore, a central hallmark of strategy is its interactive nature; proper strategy should consider the interplay between two or more adversaries. Finally, strategy is not restricted to the domain of war, as a threat of force can be suitable also in peace-time foreign policy. Indeed, this is the very essence of coercive diplomacy; being able to exert pressure without necessarily resorting to physical force.

It is important to know what *can* be considered coercive diplomacy, and equally important to know what *cannot*. In the jargon of coercive strategies, the most general term is the generic

coercion. It implies both the potential and the actual use of pressure in order to influence the actions of a voluntary actor (Freedman 2004: 26). In contrast to full-scale war, coercion is marked by limited means and objectives. It will most often occur within an asymmetric power-relationship, whereby one actor exercises superior power in order to sway the behavior of the other (Morris 2007: 104-105). This mode of using force has been said to be typical of contemporary, liberal democracies (de Wijk 2005: 11). With conditional threats, the exercise of power changes the target's behavior through the recipient's fear of (continued) punishment by the coercer's threat (or limited use) of force, should his demands not be met. Thus also limited or demonstrative use of force is considered coercion (Jakobsen 2007: 227-229). de Wijk (2005: 14) has pointed out that what is considered limited is highly subjective; while NATO used only a fraction of its total available air forces for Operation Allied Force, it is likely that the Serbs experienced the air campaign as anything but "limited" in nature. Thus, the distinction between coercive and controlling strategies is often unclear in practice, but can in theory be made when the use of force becomes so extensive as to deprive the recipient of voluntarism. In other words, when the recipient, rather than making a decision based on his own interest calculus, makes a decision because all his other options have been eliminated, the use of force is controlling and not coercive (de Wijk 2005: 14). Force used in a coercive manner is not a component of a larger, *military* strategy, but of a larger, *political-diplomatic* strategy (George 1994: 10). Coercion can be further subdivided into deterrence and compellence.

On the one hand, a strategy of deterrence is concerned with preserving the *status quo* (George 2003: vii). It aims to keep an adversary from initiating undesirable action in the first place, by threatening with and/or using force. It promises infliction of additional costs upon the adversary, should he choose to act in the undesirable fashion (Skogan 2007: 115). Another feature that distinguishes it from compellence is that unlike the latter, deterrence can also be based upon a balance of power, rather than an asymmetry.

On the other hand, there is the strategy of compellence. The originator of the term was Schelling, who generally defined it as changing the *status quo* by making another actor do something against his original will (Freedman 2004: 110). Later, this term has been further subdivided into two; what is commonly known as coercive diplomacy, and what has sometimes been called "blackmail" (Jakobsen 2007: 228). On the one hand, "blackmail" is proactive; it involves coercing another actor into initiating actions that change the *status quo*. On the other hand, coercive diplomacy is reactive, undertaken to the purpose of ending and/or

reversing undesirable action already initiated by another actor; and so return to the former *status quo*. Recalling the earlier discussion between coercive and controlling strategies, de Wijk (2005: 12-14) has introduced an intermediary step between coercive diplomacy and war. In coercive diplomacy, the main tools of economic sanctions and threats of force are used to back up an essentially diplomatic effort. According to George (1994: 10), signaling, bargaining, and negotiations are all typical elements of coercive diplomacy. However, should this step fail, the coercer might be compelled towards more directly forceful methods, i.e. into military coercion. This strategy places the now potentially large-scale military means as the main instruments, while economic tools become less important, and diplomatic channels might even be closed.

Success ultimately hinges upon a sound and appropriate strategy, and coercive diplomacy and military coercion requires quite different strategies and approaches (de Wijk 2005: 11-12). Generally, coercive strategies can take four, distinct ideal forms, where the first is punishment, i.e. inflicting pain on the civilian population, potentially spurring protests and riots that can influence or overthrow the adversary's regime. Next, risk strategies are related to punishment, by slowly increasing the adversary's risk of (increased) civilian and economic casualties, incurring a negative cost-benefit analysis. Thirdly, denial strategies are meant to counter the opponent's military strategy and/or hindering him in executing undesirable actions. Finally, decapitation directly targets key leadership and central telecommunication nodes, aiming at system collapse (Henriksen 2007: 58-59). de Wijk (2005: 13) also introduces incapacitation approaches, involving attempts at undermining the state structures of the target. Coercive diplomacy, then, typically entails political isolation, inducements, economic sanctions and risk strategies, and finally threats of force and punishment approaches. On the contrary, military coercion can be predicated upon punishment on a larger scale, denial, incapacitation, or decapitation. Furthermore, where coercive diplomacy may succeed due to fear of (further) future damage, military coercion has the greatest chance of success when force is used massively from the very start (de Wijk 2005: 13).

To sum up, coercive diplomacy is a reactive strategy of forceful persuasion, involving the threat and limited use of force for limited objectives. The strategy attempts to change the *status quo* by influencing the behavior of the adversary, inducing him to end and/or reverse an undesirable course of action. The hallmark of coercive diplomacy is using instruments like negotiation, diplomatic isolation, economic sanctions, inducements, and threats and limited

use of force to back up a diplomatic effort at crisis management. This is one of the typical ways in which liberal democracies use force today.

Generally true of all coercion, however, is that it is based on issuing threats for imposing one's own will. A threat is a signal of a conditional intention to inflict harm upon someone else (Hovi 2007: 67). The intention is conditional because harm will only be inflicted if the recipient does not act as prescribed by the sender. Existing literature on threat-making can serve as a way into further theoretical discussions. Therefore, the next section will present a short, general theoretical model of threats.

2.2 A Model of Threats

This chapter will identify the main theoretical requirements of threats in international politics. It will explain when a threat can be considered effective, and what is required to achieve that. Furthermore, the underlying assumptions are discussed in light of potential practical problems. The work done by Jon Hovi (2007: 66-85) represents a systematic overview of the theory of threats, and will form this section's main reference. Except for where stated otherwise, this section reflects Hovi's work. Hovi has identified four main theoretical requirements of threats; relevance, credibility, conditionality, and potency. A threat can be considered effective in so far as it is the dominant cause in bringing about a change in an actor's behavior that the actor would otherwise have refrained from.

In the following discussion, assume two states A and B, where the former wishes to threaten the latter to obtain a change of behavior. The first requirement, relevance, requires B to both have an incentive to act in a way undesirable to A, and the possibility of complying with A's demands. Next, credibility entails that B must truly believe that A will carry out the punishment he promised, should B refuse to comply. This is a calculation where B must take into account the incentives of A for effectuating the promised punishment. Thirdly, conditionality implies that B must believe that he is spared from the punishment if he should choose to comply, and that further threats are ruled out. Finally, a threat's potency means that the punishment must be serious enough that B has more incentive to comply with A than to simply take the punishment, thus including both B's costs of taking the punishment and the costs of his compliance.

This model of threats rests on a series of assumptions. In practice, even when all the theoretical requirements are met, threats can quite often fail to be effective. This can be the result of a number of ways in which these underlying assumptions can break. I will shortly present the most common causes, which are bounded rationality, lack of unity, evasion strategies, and unintended consequences.

Firstly, the model assumes fully rational actors, for example in their gathering of information and calculations of costs and benefits for various options. While this is a common assumption, an almost equally common counter-argument says that one cannot assume full rationality, especially when these are oppressive regimes or terrorists. Non-rationality can be an appealing explanation for explaining complex phenomena. Yet, the search for insight compels us to look beyond this conceptualization. For example, while many contemporary Western observers described the Bosnian Serbs as fanatics committed to their national cause beyond any rational understanding, it has later been noted that one of the most limiting factors for their war effort was their army's low morale and commitment in the face of mutilation and death (Cigar 2001: 213). With intimate knowledge and understanding of any actor, one will usually find that within their own perceptions of their interests, most decision-makers make well-reasoned choices, and that even terrorists and tyrannical state leaders can be highly rational (Hovi 2007: 77; Williams 2007: 195). Finally, it is also a sound scientific principle to avoid assuming non-rationality until all other possibilities have been exhausted. Therefore, I continue my discussion keeping this assumption; all actors are considered fully rational.

Secondly, the theory perceives all actors as units, i.e. as single and coherent actors. Here, this assumption is less likely to be correct; situations involving threats in international politics usually involve either states or non-state organizations. In turn, such institutions or organizations consist of a set of internal actors, who have differing opinions and preferences. Assuming unity can therefore be inaccurate for the coercer, the coerced, or both, producing varying consequences. Although this is a rather poor assumption, it is also very common, so that breaking it should be a priority. By expanding the set of actors included in the analysis, I therefore seek to relax this assumption. For the coercer, unity is still more or less assumed, although the restrictions and influences that domestic political opposition causes is sometimes account for. However, it has been noted that theories in the literature on coercive diplomacy have tended to conceptualize the adversary as a static unit with exogenously given properties and preferences at best, or simply an inanimate object to be acted upon at worst (Jentleson and Whytock 2005: 53). Such a situation is here sought avoided by including a new set of

variables in the analysis, meant to describe the targets domestic reactions and vulnerabilities to coercion.

A third cause for practical threat failure is the possibility of the adversary using evasive strategies, i.e. finding ways of mitigating the influence of the threat. This can include granting only partial or temporal concessions to the coercer. Evasive strategies can be harmful for the coercer's incentives to carry out the promised punishment, or even challenge the legitimacy of doing so. This type of failure is not accounted for by the theoretical framework, meaning that the thesis assumes that such strategies are not used.

Finally, a threat can cause unintended consequences. Such consequences might benefit the coerced even while they inflict additional costs. An example can be the politically integrative effect an external threat can bring a fragmented society. In addition to improving the domestic legitimacy of the coerced government, external pressure can also provide justification for further repression of domestic opposition (Jentleson and Whytock 2005: 54). Expectations often play a part in this argument; if the promised punishment is milder than what might be expected, it may work positively for the coerced, and vice versa. Because abilities to counter and absorb external pressure can be significant, this thesis seeks to avoid assuming that they do not occur. Conversely, most such consequences can be accounted for within the theoretical framework presented later.

2.3 Research Status

This section will deal with the research status in the subject area of coercive diplomacy. I will highlight the area's main contributors and discuss their various findings. Additionally, I will discuss which approach is most appropriate for the research question at hand. In general, studies of coercive diplomacy are few in number; there is only a handful of central theoretical works available, although much has been done in non-generalizable, historical case-analyses of various conflicts (Jakobsen 2007: 230).

2.3.1 The Pioneers: Schelling, and George and Simons

It was Thomas Schelling (1976) who pioneered the study of coercion, in his classic study *Arms and Influence*. As noted earlier, this study introduced the term compellence. Schelling was concerned with identifying general conditions influencing compellence, and approached

this task deductively. In spite of this comprehensive scope, the resulting theory was coherent and elegant. Later studies have since then moved more specifically towards coercive diplomacy, most notably by Alexander George and William Simons et al. (1994) in *The Limits of Coercive Diplomacy*. In this study, the methodological approach was inductive; they used empirical data to induce 14 conditions relevant for the outcome of coercive diplomacy. In organizing their findings, they found that the conditions could be subdivided in two groups; a set of strategy-enabling, contextual variables, and a second set of strategy-improving success variables. Needless to say, both studies have made vast contributions to the subject area. However, Peter Viggo Jakobsen (2007: 230) has argued that both studies left areas for improvement. His argument is discussed below.

According to Jakobsen, Schelling's deductive approach made it simple and elegant, but simultaneously rendered it too abstract to draw precise conclusions from. It suffered, in other words, from a lack of richness of implications (Underdal 2008). Illustratively, Schelling's logical-deductive approach cannot easily supply concrete policy prescriptions on how to meet the theory's criteria (Jakobsen 2007: 230). When Schelling was asked to use the theory to devise a bombing campaign against North Vietnam in 1964, he eventually had to give up. On the other hand, Jakobsen (2007: 230) argues, while rich in scope, implications, and realism, the most limiting factor of George and Simons' approach is perhaps a lack of parsimony. It induces a very high number of variables, and suffers further from a difficulty in clearly and unambiguously operationalizing all of them. Finally, due to the high number of variables, theoretical accounts of empirical cases become very complex, making it is hard to distinguish critical factors from less significant ones.

2.3.2 The *Ideal Policy*: Jakobsen

This reasoning induced Jakobsen (1998) to develop his *ideal policy* framework. This approach deals with post-Cold War cases of coercive diplomacy, and attempts to include both Schelling's necessary conditions and those factors George and Simons considered especially important. The *ideal policy* is aimed at fulfilling two objectives; an increased simplicity and clearly operationalized variables. To achieve this, its scope was reduced from a generic theory of coercive diplomacy, to include only liberal democracies' attempts at countering military aggression after the end of the Cold War (Jakobsen 2007: 231). In *Western use of Coercive Diplomacy after the Cold War*, Jakobsen (1998: 130) argues that coercive diplomacy has the greatest chance of succeeding when four conditions are met. Firstly, a threat of force must be

made to the adversary, promising to quickly and with little cost defeat or deny the opponent his objective. Next, a clear deadline by which the adversary must comply should be set. Thirdly, the coerced must receive assurances that compliance will not lead to further demands. Finally, the coercer should offer the opponent an inducement, a “carrot”, as compensation for complying.

In considering the utility of the *ideal policy* framework for this thesis, a few remarks can be made. Firstly, the validity of the first requirement, a threat of force, should be considered. By validity I understand the degree to which a model has internally compatible premises, and empirically observable and verifiable implications and conclusions (Underdal 2008). Jakobsen (2007: 231) postulates that acts of military aggression indicate the aggressor’s high willingness to accept costs, so that only military means are sufficiently potent as countermeasures. It is true that military force often will be required when countering military aggression, but the *ideal policy* explicitly excludes most instruments de Wijk (2005: 13, 19) identifies as the main tools of coercive diplomacy (see chapter 2.1). Furthermore, studies have shown that mixed interventions are significantly more successful than purely military or economic ones (de Wijk 2005: 92). Secondly, it should be considered whether the aim of the threat of force, i.e. to defeat or deny the adversary his objective, is too narrow. For instance, when Milošević surrendered in the final stages of Operation Allied Force, NATO was still far from ready to launch a ground invasion, and could therefore not yet militarily defeat nor deny Milošević his objective, given that this objective was control over Kosovar territory (Jakobsen 2007: 239). It might be worth considering an alternative theoretical approach where military force is not the only tool accounted for.

Finally, one of the theory’s most notable properties also requires consideration. According to de Wijk (2005: 20), contemporary theorizing and practice of coercion has often tended towards neglecting the adversary as a meaningful unit of analysis. Similarly, the *ideal policy* assumes that the outcome of coercive diplomacy can be explained through the properties of the coercer’s strategy alone (Jakobsen 2007: 233). While policy-makers are required to know the opponent on a case-by-case basis, in order to formulate appropriate threats and inducements, it is not required for analytical purposes. Instead, the adversary is analytically “black-boxed”, so that knowledge required about the target is minimized. This can perhaps be helpful, especially if information about the adversary is scarce. Nevertheless, a generic and operationalizable set of variables describing the adversary’s vulnerability to coercive diplomacy could allow for more precise and valid results.

2.3.3 Jentleson and Whytock: Knowing your Enemy

In this thesis I emphasize the importance of understanding the adversary in greater detail. Firstly, this implies relaxing the assumption of unitary actors. Arguably, the assumption should be avoided for both coercer and the coerced, but this would complicate the study beyond what can be included in this thesis. Instead, I content that considering at least the target state as a set of multiple actors grants enough benefits as to warrant a slightly more complex theoretical approach. Additionally, to the extent that unintended consequences are due to the internal conditions of the coerced, also this assumption can be relaxed. In sum, a slight increase in model complexity is warranted in light of increased validity, realism, and richness of implications.

To address the challenges identified in the last paragraphs, I will consider an alternative theoretical approach. For explaining the outcome of the U.S.-led coercive diplomacy attempt against Libya's former state-sponsored terrorism and weapons of mass destruction (WMD) program, Bruce Jentleson and Christopher Whytock (2005) developed a concise model of coercive diplomacy. Drawing on established literature, their model keeps the traditional focus on the coercer's strategy. However, they also seek to change the preferences and motivations of the adversary from exogenously given to endogenously explained. For this reason, the target state's politics and economy is also considered, explaining the coerced's domestic vulnerability to coercion. The framework offers what de Wijk (2005: 16) has called a dynamic approach to coercion, taking into account the adversary's mix of motivations, interests, and expected risks. It offers some significant improvements, including relaxing some assumptions often made in other studies. Jentleson and Whytock (2005: 50) approach coercive diplomacy by positing two sets of variables, each consisting of three variables. The first set is a conventional evaluation of the coercer's strategy, while the second set is meant to describe the target state's domestic politics and economy.

The Coercer's Strategy

The aim of any coercive strategy is clear in the abstract. It is required, from the coerced's point of view, to increase the costs of noncompliance and the benefits of compliance so that they are higher than the benefits of noncompliance and the costs of compliance. However, to put this into practice is another matter, and is an enterprise which hinges upon the coercer's ability to make the strategy meet three criteria; proportionality, reciprocity, and coercive

credibility. According to Jentleson and Whytock (2005: 51-53), all these three requirements are more likely to be met when major international actors support the initiative, and when the domestic, political opposition is small for the coercer.

In a coercive diplomatic strategy, proportionality is required between the scope and nature of the demands on the one side, and the instruments and tools by which the aims are sought secured on the other. Axiomatically, the greater the extent of the demands, the higher the costs of compliance for the adversary. This means that as more is being demanded of the target, the strategy must proportionally increase the costs of noncompliance and the benefits of compliance (Jentleson and Whytock 2005: 51). The hallmark of coercive diplomacy, however, is the threat or use of only *limited* force. This means that the costs of noncompliance can only be increased so much. If, conversely, the benefits of compliance are increased too much, the resulting strategy becomes appeasement, not coercive diplomacy. Hence, it can be concluded that coercive diplomacy is best suited in pursuit of limited objectives. As noted earlier, the meaning of limited can be debated, but in general it is somewhat easier to convince an opponent to stop short of his goal (Type A coercive diplomacy) than to reverse his *fait accompli* (Type B), but it is much yet harder to change his behavior through a change in his government, i.e. regime change (Type C) (Jentleson and Whytock 2005: 51-52).

Reciprocity is the next requirement of the coercer's strategy. It entails an explicit link between positive inducements offered by the coercer and the concessions made by the target, or at least that the link is mutually tacit (Jentleson and Whytock 2005: 52). It is imperative that the coerced does not believe it possible to gain the inducements without conceding. Furthermore, the target should not feel uncertain that these "carrots" will be granted once the concessions have been made. The trick, Jentleson and Whytock (2005: 52) say, lies in: "...*neither offering too little too late or for too much in return, nor offering too much too soon or for too little in return*".

Finally, the last requirement of the coercer's strategy is coercive credibility. This condition is fulfilled when the coercer convincingly conveys to the target that consequences invariably will follow noncompliance. Credibility is usually dependent upon the strength of the coercer's incentives for carrying out the punishment (Hovi 2007: 68). If this condition is not satisfied, the expected costs of noncompliance will, in the eyes of the coerced, be lowered significantly. As history can suggest, however, meeting this condition requires more than just being in a

position of greater military and economic power than the target (Jentleson and Whytock 2005: 52-53).

Target's Domestic Politics and Economy

The more innovative part of Jentleson and Whytock's (2005) theory is the set of variables describing the target's internal political and economic conditions. Also other theories have attempted to conceptualize the adversary as something more than an object on which the coercer acts, for example by accounting for motivational asymmetries or the balance of power. However, the authors argue, such approaches often do not address the underlying sources of such asymmetries; they do not theoretically express why different targets have different motivations, preferences, and coercive vulnerability (Jentleson and Whytock 2005: 53). This is the challenge that this second set of variables aims to meet. Seen under one, these three variables are liable to change, and can interact with other factors concerning the regime's viability. International factors can also play a role, for example in changing the geopolitical environment or shifting the global markets. Such changes must be taken into account and be controlled for, while nevertheless keeping the analytical focus on the proposed variables (Jentleson and Whytock 2005: 55).

A starting point can be identifying the absolute prime interest of all governments; their own survival. Regime self-perpetuation is taken to be the main goal of any government, whether it entails winning the next election in a democracy or maintaining the grasp on power in non-democracies (Jentleson and Whytock 2005: 54). Consequentially, the first variable asks whether the target government can gain more internal political support and regime security by either complying with or defying the coercer. Regime security can be defined as the degree to which *"...the governing elite are secure from the threat of forced removal from office and can generally rule without major challenges to their authority"* (Collins 2007: 429). When faced with external pressure, a regime can, for example, gain benefits like increased legitimacy and grounds for domestic repression, even if some costs must be paid for defiance. The result can be a politically integrative effect. In fact, for non-developed states, it has been argued that the main sources of significant threats are predominantly internal and domestic of nature. Such threats can include: *"...violent transfers of power, insurgency, secession, rebellion [...] and ultimately, state collapse and anarchy"* (Jackson 2007: 148-150). This suggests that in many cases, consideration should and will be given to the domestic situation before a regime decides whether to resist or comply with external pressure. On another note, this variable

allows relaxing the theoretical assumptions concerning unintended consequences. Effects like regime rallying can now be accounted for within the theoretical framework. Furthermore, the stronger political support the targeted government enjoys domestically, the less effect should be expected from coercive diplomacy, and vice versa (Jentleson and Whytock 2005: 54). Ironically, often when oppressive regimes seek to increase state control, the challenge from other powerful groups in society become proportionally greater, increasing their potential for acting as “transmission belts” (see below) (Jackson 2007: 148).

The next variable is the adversary’s economic calculation, including the costs brought by military action, economic sanctions, and other coercive instruments, and also the benefits brought by trade, aid, cooperation and other economic inducements (Jentleson and Whytock 2005: 54). This calculation is dependent on both the strength and flexibility of the coerced’s domestic economy, and its ability to absorb or counter such costs through abundant budgets, import substitution, alternative trading options, and similar measures which reduce economic vulnerability. However, as Jentleson and Whytock (2005: 55) point out, even when such measures are adequate to make up for the inflicted costs, bypassed trading options will often still represent significant opportunity costs. Through this variable, also coercive measures short of military force are assumed to have potential coercive effects.

Finally, the last variable entails that the target state no longer is assumed a single and coherent unit. It describes the role of political elites and other key political and societal actors in domestic decision-making and policy-formation. Given that no ruler can fully isolate himself from at least a small group of dignitaries, the interests and preferences of such actors can play a central role in determining the effects of external pressure. When coercive diplomacy threatens their interests, such groups can act as buffers, soaking up the external pressure directed at the regime, thus acting as “circuit breakers”. When, however, policy changes demanded by external coercion serve their own interests, they can become “transmission belts”, compounding and multiplying the force brought to bear on the regime (Jentleson and Whytock 2005: 55). Such individuals and groups may include rival politicians, local police and law enforcement authorities, ethnic and religious groups, criminal gangs, intelligence services, paramilitary units, and the armed forces (de Wijk 2005: 15; Jackson 2007: 150).

Limitations

As with all theories, also this one has its strengths and its challenges. Whereas the former have been outline above, the latter will be discussed in the following. Firstly, it must be considered that while it prescribes theoretical requirements for succeeding in coercive diplomacy, in itself the theory cannot move from an abstract model to the specific policy that will be required in each empirical case. Ultimately, it remains up to the policy-maker to transform these broad requirements into specific policy, suitable to impact an adversary's decision-making calculus. Next, the theory largely assumes that the adversary is a *state*, whereas de Wijk (2005: 86) argues that a full theory should apply for *actors* in general. Thirdly, as the coercer is still assumed a unitary actor, the internal dynamics within the coercing state are not accounted for. Domestic politics and restraints are likely to affect when, how, and to what effect coercive diplomacy may be used. This remains a challenge for future, theoretical development. Finally, the model presupposes a generic set of preferences for the adversary. Though more sensitive to the opponent's unique preferences than earlier theories, an unexpected combination of culture, mindset, values, and norms may still offset the accuracy of the expected vulnerability and reactions to external coercion.

3 Method

The following chapter will develop the thesis' methodological approach, in an attempt to provide transparency as to how the study was conducted, and to give well-reasoned explanations for the choices made. It will cover case selection, comparative strategy, operationalization, data collection, replicability, reliability, validity, and generalization.

3.1 Case Selection

The research question implies a relatively small universe of potential research objects. At the time of designing the study, the only two major cases of NATO governments collectively using coercive diplomacy can be said to be the interventions in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. As it is possible to analyze both within this study, chances of case selection bias and other issues are minimized. Analyzing both cases would also imply a cross-case comparative research strategy. However, chapter two identified a total of six theoretical variables for explaining the outcome of coercive diplomacy, and with only two observations, the explanation would be over-determined. To secure more robust findings one approach can be increasing the number of cases, either geographically or “longitudinally”, i.e. dividing cases historically (Knutsen 2009). While the research universe leaves little possibility of a geographical expansion, a “longitudinal”, diachronic, within-case component can be added to the analysis, by considering that the two main cases consist of a number of subordinate coercive diplomacy exchanges. It is a fair objection that such “longitudinal” divisions can be artificial, as strategy always has elements of continuity over time (Jentleson 2012 [e-mail correspondence]). Nevertheless, the same method was used in both Jakobsen's (1998) work and in part in other studies as well, so that where relevant, I will use the same “sub-case” structure. This will both make possible a more structured, comparative evaluation of the two theories at a later point in time, and serve as a safeguard by aligning my thesis to more established studies. This method increases the total number of sub-cases to twelve.¹ This implies a mid-N, comparative method with both cross-case and within-case components, an approach qualified by “...a growing consensus that the strongest means of drawing inferences from case studies is the use of a combination of within-case analysis and cross-case comparison within a single study...” (George and Bennett 2005: 18).

¹ See chapters four and five for a presentation.

As for the empirical dimension of the research question, the cases will in part serve in a disciplined configurative study, meaning that the theoretical framework will be used to explain historically important cases (George and Bennett 2005: 75). In turn, this will allow for a better understanding of what characterized NATO's most successful approaches to coercive diplomacy. Additionally, for the theoretical dimension, the case selection in some ways also represents a least-likely case-study. The selected cases are located near the limits of what the theory can be expected to account for. There are several reasons for this. Firstly, Jentleson and Whytock's theory was originally developed for explaining a single, long-term case of using coercive diplomacy to counter the Libyan, state WMD and terrorism programs, as opposed to for instance Jakobsen's theory, which was explicitly formulated to deal with instances of post-Cold War military aggression. Secondly, at its point of origin, the theory accounted for a case of largely unilateral coercive diplomacy, whereas here it will attempt to explain cases of coalitional coercive diplomacy, generally acknowledged to be more challenging (c.f. Jakobsen 1998). Finally, this theory is relatively new and untested, and has not yet had much time to be refined. Therefore, any systematic application outside its original scope can be considered as new ground for the theory. Given these considerations, should the theory prove able to adequately explain and predict the cases at hand, it will have passed what Alexander George and Andrew Bennett (2005: 76) have called a "tough test", adding to its credibility and strengthening its research status.

3.2 Method of Comparison

Having selected the cases, the next question becomes how best to compare them. George and Bennett (2005: 67) suggests a method of structured, focused comparison. This entails that the researcher asks the same set of standardized questions for each case, to guide and govern the data collection. These questions will be derived from the theoretical variables, which are operationalized in the next section. This ensures that the collected data will be comparative across the cases. Furthermore, the method prescribes that only relevant aspects are examined for each case, as opposed to looking at them holistically. Thus, while the conflicts in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo were immensely complex, I will only discuss observations relevant for the operationalized variables. Knowledge about the general course of the conflicts is assumed on behalf of the reader.

For comparison of the data with the theoretical framework, the best approach might be the congruence method, an approach offering enough flexibility to be combined with both the disciplined-configurative dimension and the theory testing, “tough-test” element (George and Bennett 2005: 182). This will mean evaluating how suitable the given theory is for explaining and/or predicting the outcomes of the examined cases. A prerequisite is that the theory posits a relationship between certain values on its independent variables and a specific outcome or value on the dependent variable. In turn, this requires determination of the values for all the variables in all the cases, before these are compared with the variance in the dependent variable. If the theory is sound, the actual outcome should covariate with the values of the independent variable and the expected value of the dependent variable in most of the cases. The degree of congruence is measured by comparing how often the theoretically predicted outcome concurs with the actual, historical outcome. Finally, if the theory largely predicts the outcome correctly, a causal relationship may exist between the specified variables.

Some studies follow up congruence-based findings with a process-tracing approach, whereby the causal mechanisms leading from cause to effect, via intermediary variables, are explored (George and Bennett 2005: 200-206). While this probably would be constructive also in this study, limitations on time, space, and resources dictate that it at present cannot be included. Rather, to reinforce the findings, some process-tracing-like elements are at times integrated in the case studies. Taking the step to a full-scaled process-tracing approach can perhaps be one of the most notable improvements for the future.

3.3 Operationalization and Classification

The purpose of this section is to operationalize the abstract theoretical variables presented in chapter two. Standardization secures the “structured” element of the comparative method, as it ensures the comparability of the collected data. Because of the limited nature of this thesis, it is necessary to construct a robust, but simple methodological framework. Furthermore, as the study includes only two case studies with a total of twelve sub-cases, a too complex framework can lead to over-determination or incorrect inferences. Therefore, the variables will be dichotomized, so each variable can be classified with only one of two possible values; either positive, i.e. that the condition is favorable to a successful outcome, or negative, meaning that it is not. This may be criticized for being too blunt, but it nevertheless grants a significant degree of robustness.

The measurement and classification of values for each variable, in each sub-case, will ultimately be a subjective, case-by-case activity. Because the issues at hand are so complex, there is no way to formulate a generic formula or schema for measuring the value of the variables. This does not have to mean that the process will be unscientific, however. Instead, I seek to explicitly clarify the considerations that lead to the determination of the values. This transparency will help secure a systematic and consistent approach to the data.

3.3.1 The Dependent Variable

The dependent variable, i.e. whether the coercive effort was the dominant cause in bringing about the target's compliance, will be dichotomized. This presents a challenge, because Jentleson and Whytock (2005) do not state explicitly whether all the independent variables are considered necessary, or whether only a subset of them can be sufficient in some cases. Essentially, this questions whether the theory should be understood in deterministic or probabilistic terms (Knutsen 2009). While deterministic relationships are extremely rare in the social sciences, they are also the easiest to test, and the most conservative assumption. Therefore, the initial hypothesis will be that for all variables, positive values are considered necessary for a successful outcome. To sum up, the theory will predict success when all variables are positive, and failure if one or more are negative. One can probably expect, however, that the empirical data will demonstrate a more probabilistic relationship than what I have assumed.

3.3.2 The Coercer's Strategy

The first group of independent variables describes the coercer's strategy, and the first variable is proportionality. Proportionality is considered positive if the costs of noncompliance exceed and are proportional to the costs of compliance. These costs derive from the extensiveness of the coercer's objectives and the instruments used to pursue them. Therefore, proportionality also demands clear and defined objectives. While it essentially is a simple cost-benefit analysis of the coerced's various options, specifically determining the calculus promises a challenging endeavor. For this reason, intimate knowledge about the research objects is a requirement. Finally, because coercive diplomacy by definition employs only limited means, proportionality dictates that also the aims must be sufficiently limited. I therefore postulate that Type A (stopping short of the goal) and Type B (reversing an action) coercive diplomacy are considered limited, while Type C (regime change) is not.

Next, reciprocity will be classified positively when there exists either a tacit or an explicit link between the concessions demanded of the coerced and positive inducements offered by the coercer. These elements are mutually required for reciprocity to be positive. Finally, in terms of costs and benefits, the inducements must be proportionate to the concession, and must be offered at roughly the same time.

The last variable pertaining to the coercer's strategy is coercive credibility. Of the three, this is perhaps the most difficult to define clearly, because it simply requires the adversary to truly believe there will be consequences for noncompliance. This will have to be determined by evaluating the statements and actions of the coerced, to scan for hints of his expectations.

3.3.3 Target's Domestic Politics and Economy

The last three variables are grouped together, describing the target's domestic politics and economy. The first variable is internal political support and regime security. It will be considered positive if the coerced government can gain a larger increase in support from relevant individuals and institutions within the coerced's society by complying with the demands, rather than defying them. Should the opposite be true, that defiance and noncompliance for example can lead to larger politically integrative effects, then this variable is considered negative. Changes in support can be measured by what election results indicate, as well as by developments making it more or less likely that the ruling regime will be forcibly challenged or removed. Finally, the greater such support is, the less effects can be expected of external threats.

Secondly, the economic costs and benefits of the coerced's response to threats constitutes the next variable. This requires a summation of the coerced's tangible costs and benefits of military action, economic sanctions, trade, aid, and other forms of economic inducements. Here, changes in gross domestic product (GDP) or gross national product can be central measurements (de Wijk 2005: 94). The calculation will be affected by the strength of the coerced's economy, and its ability to negate negative impact, for example through trade alternatives and import substitutions. If the threatened punishment causes significant economic costs for the adversary, then this variable is considered positive. Significant is understood as a level at which it becomes a contributing factor affecting the voluntary behavior of the adversary's decision-makers.

Finally, the last variable is the role of elites and key actors. This can be considered positive when the consequences of conceding to the coercer's demands are constructive, in terms of the individual preferences of a majority of the key actors and elites in the target society. Should this be the case, they become "transmission belts", multiplying the threat's pressure against the decision-makers. Should, however, the elite's preferences be threatened by conceding, these actors become "circuit breakers", isolating the decision-makers from external pressure. In that case, the variable will be assigned a negative value.

3.4 Data Collection

In gathering data for constructing the case studies and measuring the variables, I have as far as possible sought a triangulation of primary data sources. Additionally, I have used secondary literature as a supplement for organizing the study, ensuring that no significant aspects were neglected. The first types of primary sources were the statements and memoirs of involved individuals, generally available in the form of published works, like autobiographies. Sometimes, such statements were first found in secondary literature. In these cases, I have tried to verify the statements, while letting the references also indicate the secondary source, so as to give credit to its author. Secondly, official texts, treaties, and press statements by relevant institutions were included; these data are often made available electronically on the institutions' web-sites. Finally, George and Bennett (2005: 97) argue that the public context in which central decisions and developments take place often matters, so that the last source of primary sources should be contemporary media and news reports. These sources are often available either as paper copies in well-equipped libraries, or as electronic articles in various news agencies' internet databases. Finally, this thesis does not supply any new empirical data, but is instead based on analyzing existing data in new light.

3.5 Replicability, Validity, and Reliability

Often, when using the structured, focused comparison, validity and reliability are higher in case studies than in large-N approaches. This is because the researcher moves closer to the data, and often gains intimate knowledge about the issue at hand. Furthermore, case-studies are especially suited for good operationalizations, or construct validity, in addition to internal validity, i.e. the ability to determine whether a relationship between variables is causal in nature (Bratberg 2009). Although this is a fairly good starting point, further measures have

been taken to secure replicability, validity, and reliability. First of all, I have consistently sought to describe and explain the research procedure as clearly as possible, in an attempt to secure transparency. This, say George and Bennett (2005: 106), is a necessary procedure to meet the specified criteria.

Where possible, general statements on how the variables have been measured are given, meanwhile choices taken with respect to measurement and classification are explicitly explained. This is positive for the study's reliability. Reliability was also sought enhanced throughout the data collection process. Firstly, I have attempted to use mainly primary data sources. Furthermore, the data triangulation helped safeguard against potential errors and biases in any one source, while the use of guiding secondary literature rooted the thesis in more established research.

3.6 Generalization

If case studies often score high on the former three criteria, then they equally often suffer in the criteria of generalization, or external validity. Finding generalized causal effects, or the relative weight of these, can be very difficult with such research designs. This should be taken into consideration when assessing the implications of the findings. Nevertheless, given that the thesis' research units can be said to be part of a clearly defined class of objects, i.e. coercive diplomacy, some contingent generalization can be warranted (George and Bennett 2005: 233). In other words, limited generalizations can be valid for a universe of incidents quite similar to the research objects; this grants the cases analytical, not statistical, representivity (Yin 2003). That the study includes both within-case and cross-case comparison further supports this claim. As both cases characterizing the universe of research objects are included, contingent generalizations will mainly be valid for potential future incidents of the NATO governments collectively using coercive diplomacy as a crisis management strategy in third-party conflicts. This is an even more narrowly defined class than general coercive diplomacy, granting the generalizations further validity (George and Bennett 2005: 77). Though contingent, the findings can hopefully provide some insight the next time NATO decision-makers consider using coercive diplomacy.

4 Bosnia-Herzegovina

This chapter is dedicated to a case-study of NATO's use of coercive diplomacy during the 1992-1995 conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The chapter is divided into several sections; I will first briefly consider the sources of conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina. This provides some basic information, and works as an introduction to the case-study. Next, because some key actors are central for several sub-cases, they are discussed before the sub-cases themselves, so as to avoid unnecessary repetition. Finally, the third section empirically presents seven sub-cases, each of which is then also related analytically to the thesis' theoretical framework.

4.1 Sources of Conflict

This section concerns the sources of conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina. This extremely complex issue has had to be somewhat simplified, so that I have limited the discussion to the events ultimately leading to the involvement of NATO. The break-up of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY) was already inevitable by the time Bosnia-Herzegovina, one of the SFRY's six republics, started to draw the attention of Western observers. By the early nineties, the Serbs, as Yugoslavia's dominant ethnic group, had taken dramatic steps to hold together their disintegrating country.² The Serbs had had strong interests in keeping Yugoslavia intact; the republic of Serbia and its capital Belgrade had constituted the heartland of the SFRY, and the federal system of government had arguably favored the Serbs over other ethnic groups. After the death of the SFRY's charismatic dictator Josep Broz Tito in 1980, political paralysis and ethnic tensions came on the rise in a country ravaged by economic disaster. In this chaotic environment, a fairly anonymous political figure soon started his ascent to power. Slobodan Milošević, a former communist politician, overnight seemingly turned nationalist, would leave a lasting impression on all of Yugoslavia.

Partly alarmed by Serb nationalism, and partly fuelled by their own nationalist ambitions, several SFRY republics were quickly drawn towards independence (BBC 1995a). After decades under Tito and his "Brotherhood and Unity" maxim however, ethnic diffusion was common. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, while over 40% of the inhabitants were Bosnian Muslims, a

² For practical reasons, the term "Serb" refers to the larger ethnic group, e.g. Croatian Serbs, Bosnian Serbs, or the Serbs of Serbia. Meanwhile, the term "Serbian" specifically refers to the nationality of the people and institutions of the country of Serbia.

significant Serb minority lived in scattered enclaves, constituting one third of the population. Likewise, Bosnian Croats were also commonplace. As the power of the federal authorities waned, both ethnic minorities insisted upon what they perceived as legitimate, historical claims to parts of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and in time, both would turn to violence to secure them. In early 1992, by then the third secessionist SFRY republic, the Bosnian bid for independence was strongly opposed by most of the Serb minority. Consequently, the referendum of independence organized by the Bosnian parliament in February and March was largely boycotted by the Bosnian Serbs. When on 5 March Bosnian independence was declared regardless, Bosnian Serb nationalists set up roadblocks in response. Soon fighting erupted; the fires of nationalism had yet again spurred political violence. As Bosnian militia seized downtown Sarajevo, Bosnian Serb paramilitary elements took positions on the capital's surrounding hills (BBC 1995b).

For a short period an uneasy truce was engineered between Bosnian President Alija Izetbegović and Bosnian Serb political leader Dr. Radovan Karadžić. Behind the scenes however, 80,000 fully trained and equipped Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) regulars were transferred to Bosnian Serbs control, on Serbian President Milošević's command. Meanwhile, paramilitaries equipped by the Serbian secret police approached the city of Bijeljina, near the Bosnian-Serbian border (BBC 1995b). Over the first days of April, Bosnian Serb forces began attacking civilians in Bijeljina and Sarajevo, triggering Izetbegović to mobilize the National Guard and reserve police units (The New York Times 1992a). On 5 April Bosnian Serb artillery began sporadic shelling of Sarajevo. The republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina had flared up in armed conflict, a conflict that would soon rank among the worst in Europe's post-World War II history.

4.2 Elites and Key Actors

This section discusses key individuals and institutions; who they were, what their motivations were, and what interests they probably had. While it is impossible to sum up the entire personality or *ethos* of a person or institution in only a few paragraphs, seeing available empirical evidence in concert with the assumption of rational actors can help understand what role they played.

Slobodan Milošević and the Serbian Government

The man widely recognized as the main driver behind the wars and ethnic cleansing in Yugoslavia nearly stumbled upon his political fortune. Characterized as aloof and humorless, the name Slobodan Milošević raised few eyebrows before April 1987 (The New York Times 1992b). Ethnic unrest between the Albanian majority and Serb nationalists in the SFRY's poorest region, Kosovo, had prompted federal authorities to send Milošević to calm the situation. After unsuccessfully reiterating Yugoslav-communist maxims and "Brotherhood and Unity", Milošević neglected proper communist etiquette, and agreed to meet with representatives of the Serb nationalists. During this meeting, on 24 April, a throng of Serb extremists provoked the local police force into starting a brawl. Milošević quit the meeting to see what the commotion was about, only to find what he perceived as evidence of the alleged Albanian abuse of the Serb minority. After a moment of hesitation he proclaimed what Serbian television later shrewdly exploited as political propaganda; no Serb should have to be beaten ever again (BBC 1995a). The myth of Milošević had been created.

Amid economic paralysis and societal upheaval, Milošević had discovered how much political potential there was in Serb nationalism. He turned, almost overnight, from communist to nationalist, gaining power and influence rapidly. He was a politician, according to an anonymous source who worked with Milošević, who: "...*decides first what is expedient for him to believe, then he believes it*" (The New York Times 1992b). Using street protests and rallies, Milošević fanned the fires of Serb nationalism across all the republics (BBC 1995a). In particular by supporting the *prečani*³, he presented himself as the hero and protector of "Serbianess". At first impressions, Milošević could often seem charming and hospitable; a smart and likeable man. For those with knowledge of and experience in Balkan politics and history however, it has been said one could easily see through this superficial image to the ruthless pragmatist underneath (Holbrooke 1998: 4).

Milošević's political position was founded on the support of four major institutions, or four pillars of power, as some NATO officials later came to name them. These were the political system, the media, the Serb security forces, and the economic system (Lambeth 2001: 39). Milošević's most significant political powerbase was in the south of Serbia, where geographical proximity to large populations of ethnic Albanians was perceived as a threat to

³ Serbs living west of river Drina, i.e. Serbs in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia.

Serb culture (Owen 1996: 59-60). In de Wijk's (2005: 61) words: "[t]hey won elections by exploiting the ethnic differences within the country". Milošević's support in the security forces mainly stemmed from the various police departments, as well as from the militia and other paramilitary elements (Owen 1995: 174). The JNA, on the other hand, was never quite fully under his control. Next, the Serbian government in general, and Milošević especially, apprehended the great significance of television in the Balkans. It was to a significant extent through this medium that Milošević spread his violence-provoking nationalism, from the top-down (Holbrooke 1998: 24). The impact of manipulative television-broadcasts was demonstrated, and perhaps first learnt by Milošević, by the role it played in his 1987 Kosovo Polje appearance. As one protester in the October 2000 riots so bluntly put it: "[i]f State TV falls, government falls" (BBC 2003b). Finally, Milošević's support in the economic system depended both on his ability to deliver tangible improvements to the general public, and the support of major economic actors ranging from criminal smugglers to oligopolistic businessmen.

According to strategic analyst Dr. Norman Cigar (2001: 201), domestic interests were key in determining the behavior of the Serbian government, where domestic political support, power, legitimacy, and the consolidation of Milošević's position were considered the main priorities. Milošević had often come under pressure from the latent resistance of the Serbian opposition, and he used external conflict as a safety valve, directing such resistance away from his regime, enhancing regime security. The United States (U.S.) diplomat Richard Holbrooke (1998: 24) has argued that as a substitute for dealing with the numerous, difficult, and serious governance issues left by the outgoing Tito-regime, the leaders of Serbia brought their people war. An illustration is found in the words of Borisav Jović (cited in Cigar 2001: 201), friend and adviser to Milošević:

What would have happened with the energy of half a century of suppression of Serbian nationalist feelings? Would that enormous energy have exploded, and how, and would we have had a political war among the Serbs?

Though not stating so explicitly in public, the ultimate goal of the Serbian government was, according to Cigar (2001: 200-201, 208), the establishment of, and addition of territory to, a Greater Serbia, in this case through the creation of the Republika Srpska. This was justified by insisting on a historical claim in Bosnia-Herzegovina; Croatian President Stjepan Mesić once asked Jović (cited in Cigar 2001: 207) what Serb aims were, and was told that: "66 per cent of

Bosnia-Herzegovina is Serb and we shall take that". Milošević (cited in Cigar 2001: 205) himself was known to state his ambitions as "...all Serbs in a single state".

To realize these goals, ethnic cleansing was considered an acceptable instrument, suitable for consolidating captured territory. By "purifying" the ethnicity of the local population and culture, a boost to their "Serbianess" was generated, thus creating a sense of legitimacy for the occupation. This cold, hard logic required specific conditions to operate, under which it could be justified and sustained. The *sine qua non* of this practice was therefore the extreme ethno-nationalism that, albeit to various extent, dominated the political landscapes of the belligerents (Switzer 2001: 290). A noteworthy implication is that the center of gravity of Serb politics was thus shifted from the set of military forces and/or political nodes, and towards the people themselves. Compromise is perhaps the greatest threat to extreme fundamentalism, and this was one of the main reasons why the propagation of ethnic hatred, all the way down to the individual level, was so central (Switzer 2001: 291).

The JNA, the VJ, and the VRS

Western debaters have sometimes argued that the Yugoslav wars represented a new form of warfare, a war bereft of strategy, reliant on guerilla tactics and paramilitary forces. In contrast, the opposite argument can also be made; that these wars were not fundamentally different from other, superficially more traditional wars (c.f. Magaš and Žanić 2001). Keeping with the assumption of rational actors, it is reasonable to claim that the Serb leaders fought for concrete and tangible political and military objectives. Furthermore, in their pursuit of these goals, their overall strategy, tactics, and the type of military units with main impact, were on the whole quite traditional and conventional (Cigar 2001: 208).

The JNA, by then an outdated federal relic, was dissolved in the summer of 1992. Subsequently, the Yugoslav Army (VJ) was established, while its units stationed in Bosnia-Herzegovina were organized as a separate entity, the Army of Republika Srpska (VRS), soon to become the army of the Bosnian Serbs. For the JNA, and later also for the VRS, the operational, military aims included the capture and control of key terrain, including cities, especially Sarajevo, transportation and communication nodes, and access points to the sea (Cigar 2001: 209).

The VRS could uphold their war effort only due to rich support from Serbia and the JNA/VJ, in personnel, training, planning, medical support, intelligence, logistics, and air defense

coverage (Cigar 2001: 209). Whole formations were directly loaned from the JNA to the VRS, and VRS officers would receive their pay and promotions from the JNA. According to Jović (BBC 1995b): “[w]e provided the Bosnian Serbs with an army, we promised to pay all their costs...”. In other words, the Bosnian Serbs were also supported by Belgrade in economic terms, whose government at times spent almost one fourth of its budget granting such financial aid (Cigar 2001: 209-210). This was crucial to the fighting capacity of the VRS. Despite trying to downplay its role, it was in reality Belgrade that was the central point of decision-making for the Bosnian Serb war effort and strategy.

At the outset, the military balance was significantly to the advantage of the VRS, which especially enjoyed advantages in ground-based heavy weapons like tanks and artillery (Owen 1996: 55). The main impact of the paramilitary forces, on the other hand, was not in spearhead combat, but in their relative effectiveness at ethnic cleansing. This has often been overlooked by Western analysts placing too much emphasis on their impact on combat operations (Cigar 2001: 212).

The VRS was never a very well-run machinery. Despite the substantive support, it did not perform up to par, its weaknesses including a relative lack of internal cohesion, morale, and commitment (Owen 1995: 291). Additionally, it suffered from problems with command and control capacities, mobility, the use of integrated forces, and extended logistics. Most critically however, it was the support of the Bosnian Serb people which often was lacking. This is illustrated by the many Bosnian Serbs who sought to avoid military service, because they saw the military’s goals as simple and illegitimate territorial expansion (Cigar 2001: 212-213). The numbers of deserters and draft dodgers are thought to be as high as 120,000-150,000 from Bosnia alone, entailing that the VRS was unable to fully exploit their advantage in equipment and arms. The VRS could simply not afford to be strong everywhere, but was compelled to prioritize their grip around key areas, of which the loss of any one could have spelled the end of Republika Srpska (Switzer 2001: 298). In Bosnia, such areas included Brčko, Banja Luka, and Goražde. The call-up crisis also affected those already enrolled, and as morale was plummeting, extensive war weariness was a significant problem already by 1994 (Cigar 2001: 214). This further escalated with time, as few Serbs had considered in advance that the war could become so protracted. Illustratively, Milošević (cited in Cigar 2001: 217) later stated that: “*I never thought it would go on so long*”.

Ratko Mladić

General Ratko Mladić was a Bosnian Serb military leader, made commander of the Serb forces in Bosnia-Herzegovina by Milošević (Owen 1996: 166). Born in 1943 at Božanovići, Mladić attended the Military Academy before he joined the League of Communists. A ruthless character, he enjoyed a rapidly developing military career in the JNA, avoiding strong political beliefs. He soon gained widespread support within the JNA; to many common soldiers he represented a true Serb hero, taking part in their hardships and victories. His support in the JNA was so strong that he did not seem to worry about indictments by the International Criminal Tribunal (ICTY), as any government would be hard-pressed to extradite him (Owen 1996: 165).

His position ultimately hinged upon bravery, military honor, and achievements, not political support. Mladić could often better secure his position by being confrontational rather than cooperative, because his “...*bravado statements [were] calculated to boost the morale of his peasant soldiers*” (Owen 1996: 166). Consequently, Mladić often sought to agitate and confront those he disagreed with, including Western negotiators and representatives. According to the British politician Lord David Owen (1996: 82), who met the general several times, Mladić seemed to relish getting a real fight on his hands by combating NATO forces rather than harassing civilian Muslims, a task he almost found beneath himself.

Nevertheless, following the turn of the fortunes of war, rising Serb casualty levels, and the suicide of his own daughter, he increasingly avoided his earlier bravado stance, becoming quieter, more absorbing and reflected (Owen 1995: 280). Mladić was confident in his knowledge of NATO weapon-systems and tactics, and, calculating and rational in nature, always weighed the chance of UN or NATO airstrikes or other military action in contrast to alternative options, before deciding what to do. His vision for Serbia was an extensive and continuous territory, including Trebinje, Pale, Bijeljina, Banja Luka, and Knin (Owen 1996: 167).

Radovan Karadžić

Originally from Montenegro, the Bosnian Serb political leader Dr. Radovan Karadžić lived in Sarajevo from adolescence. Educated a psychiatrist, he formed early bonds with Momčilo Krajišnik (see below), especially following inconclusive accusations of embezzlement against the two (Owen 1995: 186). In 1989 Karadžić became president of the Serbian Democratic

Party, and after the self-proclaimed independence of Republika Srpska he acted as its first president. Explicitly skeptical of NATO, he considered any such presence in Bosnia a foreign occupation. On the other hand, UN peace-keepers were more acceptable to Karadžić, perhaps because of the implied security guarantee that would come with Russian participation (The New York Times 1992c). In his vision for Sarajevo, Karadžić saw a green line running down the middle of the city, dividing Bosnians from Serbs; a forced ethnic separation in the same city which, until the war, had had the strongest tradition of ethnic tolerance and the most mixed marriages in all of the SFRY (BBC 1995b; Jakobsen 1998: 82).

According to Lord Owen (1995: 186-187; 1996: 52) who met also Karadžić, the latter was easily underestimated by his theatrical appearance and conduct, and his ability to deflect direct questions with deliberate lies and an innocent facial expression. Nevertheless, Karadžić was much less confident and more nervous than he at first appeared. He also attempted to distance himself from the old communist system by emphasizing himself as religious and market-economy oriented. Although initially cooperating with Serbian leadership, in time he would increasingly separate himself from Milošević (Owen 1996: 52).

Momčilo Krajišnik

Yet another important figure in Bosnian Serb politics was Momčilo Krajišnik, the President of the Bosnian Serb Assembly in Pale. A rich and religious man, Krajišnik could at times be very single-minded, but nevertheless commanded more respect from Bosnian Muslims than most other Serb leaders (Owen 1996: 53). That he owned real estate in the Sarajevo region made him extremely rigid in negotiations over this area, demanding Serb ownership over unproportionally large parts. The personality of Krajišnik sums up what General Mladić detested in politicians, the latter claiming Krajišnik a corrupt and egocentric business man (Owen 1995: 50).

4.3 NATO Coercive Diplomacy

The context for NATO's first post-Cold War mission was extremely demanding. Firstly, NATO was not responsible for carrying out most of the actual negotiations, which instead were organized by a variety of international actors (Burg 2003: 62). As these other actors had their own agendas and preferences, a simple one-to-one relationship between the negotiator and the coercer was missing. Furthermore, the geopolitical environment was demanding, with

not only differing crisis management paradigms across the Atlantic, but often also significant Russian opposition.

I will in the following present and discuss the NATO governments' attempts at coercive diplomacy in Bosnia-Herzegovina. This is organized through seven sections, each detailing one sub-case. For each sub-case, relevant, empirical data is first sought presented objectively. Based on this data, each section then analyzes the data to determine values for the operationalized variables. For each group of variables, all determined values are stated first, before the justification follows. Furthermore, because of limitations on space, additional historical detail may be blended into the analytical write-up. This mode of organization has been recommended by George and Bennett (2005: 94). Finally, because the first sections include some information relevant for all the cases, they will be slightly longer than the others. The seven sub-cases of NATO coercive diplomacy are the NATO-WEU Naval Blockade, Operation Deny Flight, the Siege of Sarajevo, the Markale Marketplace Massacre, Assault at Goražde, the Tuzla Shelling, and Operation Deliberate Force.

4.3.1 The NATO-WEU Naval Blockade

NATO's first steps towards involvement in Bosnia-Herzegovina occurred in the summer of 1992, following the outbreak of hostilities in the wake of the Bosnian declaration of independence. The task at hand was implementing United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 713, establishing a "...*general and complete embargo on all deliveries of weapons and military equipment to Yugoslavia...*" for securing peace and stability (UNSCR 713 1991). Also UNSCR 757 was on the agenda, including economic sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY), to back up a United Nation's (UN) demand for an immediate cease-fire, the disbandment of irregular forces, and the withdrawal of the JNA from Bosnia-Herzegovina.

In many ways, the arms embargo was a result of a primarily European determination to avoid conflict escalation. In the U.S., on the other hand, many felt that the overwhelming military advantage enjoyed by the JNA and the VRS would only sustain the momentum of the conflict. Splits within the Alliance became visible as U.S. policy-makers felt compelled to comply with its West-European allies, meanwhile Turkey sought backchannels to funnel weapons to its Muslim brothers (Switzer 2001: 297). On 10 July the foreign ministers of NATO and the West European Union decided, however, to dispatch naval forces to the

international waters of the Adriatic, to “...monitor compliance with UN Security Council Resolutions 713 and 757” (NATO.int 1992). Initially, these had no stop and search rights, and could only question ship crews. They reported suspicions back to their governments, who could then attempt to deal with the matter in the UN (Owen 1996: 49). Following UNSCR 787 in November however, Operation Maritime Guard, and later Operation Sharp Guard, were commenced, authorizing the use of force to enforce stop and search rights. Once implemented, these measures increased the effectiveness of the embargo significantly.

Meanwhile, the economic sanctions imposed on the FRY from 30 May introduced significant limitations to the Serbian economy (Henriksen 2007: 110). Already in steady decline for a decade, the Yugoslav economy was devastated at the outset of 1991; inflation was skyrocketing, major companies had been compelled to halt production, and wages were halved over a period of three years (The New York Times 1992d). Compounding this development, the sanctions, according to Holbrooke (1998: 4), had a great effect on further disrupting and damaging the FRY economy. This is evident in table 4.1 below, detailing the rapid decline of Serbia’s GDP per capita in the first half of the nineties. Initially, the sanctions rallied the population around its government, but the mood later changed, especially as the Serbian Presidency elections were coming up in late 1992 (Owen 1996: 59). In time, the continued poor economic performance, hyperinflation, and sinking living standards caused domestic friction that ate away at the social fabric, and rights and securities of individuals and families (Henriksen 2007: 110-112).

Table 4.1: Serbian economy’s performance in the early nineties (UN.org)

Year	Annual Change in GDP (%)	GDP per Capita (USD)
1990	N/A	4,098
1991	-11.7	3,898
1992	-28.1	2,864
1993	-30.4	2,034
1994	2.6	2,128
1995	5.7	2,294

In the run for the Serbian presidency, Milošević was the main contender. However, he was challenged by two other notable political figures; the Serbian-American millionaire and FRY Prime Minister, Milan Panić, and the more senior Serbian writer and FRY President, Dobrica Ćosić. On the one hand, Panić was gaining popularity, especially with the intelligentsia and the young, although his popularity was not so much due to his political prowess as to the possibility he represented for ending the war and lifting the sanctions (Owen 1996: 59). On the other hand, Ćosić was perceived, especially by Lord Owen and his American colleague UN representative Cyrus Vance, as the more likely candidate to defeat Milošević. To avoid splitting the opposition, Panić was persuaded to forego his ambitions, thus improving Ćosić's chances. However, Ćosić became severely ill in the final run-up, and when he ultimately decided not to continue his candidacy, Panić became free to try.

Both Panić and Ćosić had in part run their political platforms on accommodation of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) demands. When the election results were settled however, it became clear that Panić had lost the elections to the nationalist-oriented Milošević. Lord Owen (1996: 60) has argued that given the relatively good results obtained by Panić, it is likely that Ćosić could have won, had he participated. Regardless, Panić's main loss of popular support ensued when the international community failed to take account of the political developments in Serbia by not promising tangible "carrots" to Milošević's political opponents, as a reward for their wish to comply (Owen 1996: 61). For many Serbs, this justified Milošević's hardline position. Over the next few months, the VRS, with the support of a nationalist Serbian government, launched offensives against Sarajevo and the Bosnian Muslims, demonstrating the NATO-WEU naval blockade's failure to coerce the Serbs into peace.

Analysis

The outcome of the first sub-case should be considered negative, as the fighting in Bosnia did not subside. As for the coercive strategy, in light of the following analysis, both proportionality and reciprocity are classified as negative, while credibility is considered positive. NATO's decision to establish an Adriatic naval presence was meant to back up demands for an immediate cease-fire and the disbandment and/or withdrawal of Serb security forces in Bosnia-Herzegovina. These objectives were moderately limited type B coercive diplomacy. Given the Alliance's unstable political situation however, the weapons embargo was in practice riddled with holes, allowing a number of actors to bring in war supplies for the

continuation of hostilities (Owen 1996: 49; Switzer 2001: 297). Nevertheless, after UNSCR 787, operations Maritime and Sharp Guard were both credible and sufficiently well executed that the belligerents' balance of force was not liable to change significantly. Thus the embargo unintentionally functioned as a strengthening of the Bosnian Serb position, already enjoying advantages in equipment and arms (Cigar 2001: 217). The embargo therefore contributed low, almost negative, costs of noncompliance. On the other hand, and while initially insufficient, the economic sanctions became in the long run a paramount factor for coercing a Serbian change of behavior. In fact, it has been argued that they constituted the main bargaining chip in negotiations with Milošević (Holbrooke 1998: 4). In a longer perspective, they generated significant economic costs and internal friction, eroding Milošević's grasp on power.

Next, tangible inducements were generally not promised; the benefit-side of Panić's and Ćosić's wish to comply was illustratively neglected. Furthermore, this caused them a loss of popular support, and further weakened potential political opposition to Milošević. Finally, as early as 1991, Milošević (cited in Cigar 2001: 207) had calculated that a Western intervention in the Balkans was unlikely: *"I believe and assess, and those are not only my assessments, that the great powers will not intervene in Yugoslavia"*. Hence from the outset of the conflict, NATO's credibility was low. Dispatching a naval force could have moderated this perception, inducing some Serb uncertainty about NATO's intentions, but the initial lack of stop and search rights only reinforced the Serb perception. After UNSCR 787 however, the credibility of the blockade threat was increased, and both the weapons embargo and the economic sanctions generated significant disruptive effects.

Milošević and his government had strong domestic incentives for most of their actions. This is reflected by considering regime support and security negative, although the economic calculus was positive for the coercer. Finally, the role of elites was negative. Milošević's position was not only based on political nationalism, but also on the support of the security forces, who through engagement in Bosnia directed latent internal opposition outwards. Compliance with the UNSCR demands would entail compromise, abandoning their inflexible nationalism, and would likely have lost Milošević the support of the Serb radicals. That the Serbian Radical Party (SRS) won almost one fourth of the seats in the national assembly speaks volumes about the importance of this support (IPU.org). Furthermore, disbandment of the security forces in Bosnia would have meant the loss of yet another power base. On the other hand, both the initial, politically integrative effect of the economic sanctions, and Milošević's continued defiance of the UNSC, gained him political supporters in the short

term, in spite of the long-term, changing public mood. This, respectively, contributed to moderate increases in the costs of compliance and the benefits of noncompliance. As evident in table 4.1, the costs of the Serb military effort in concert with international sanctions made the country's GDP drop dramatically, which generated a costly result for the Serbian economic calculus. Additionally, the foreign demands not only threatened both the interests and the existence of a key institution, i.e. the Serb security forces in Bosnia, but also opposed the interests of the SRS, Milošević's indispensable political allies. Finally, the lack of Western accommodation for the political platforms of Panić and Ćosić also denied gaining alternative "transmission belts" against the Serbian government.

4.3.2 Operation Deny Flight

Western television broadcasts of the atrocities committed in Bosnia soon made the "CNN-factor" pressure the NATO governments, especially against the unacceptability of contemporary U.S. foreign policy. It has been argued that the U.S. agenda had so far been simply "doing something" about Bosnia-Herzegovina (Williams 2001: 279). Consequentially, 1993 began with U.S. President Bill Clinton attempting a more determined course of action, eventually producing the "lift and strike" policy. This policy entailed lifting the arms embargo to let the Bosnian Muslims defend themselves, while striking the Serbs by air (Clark 2001: 37). In Europe the policy met with resistance, largely because several countries had deployed UN peacekeepers (UNPROFOR) to Bosnia, exposed to Serb retaliations for airstrikes (Henriksen 2007: 94; Holbrooke 1998: 54-55). The Clinton administration, new in office and preoccupied by other international crises, failed to provide strong leadership, and instead turned to support a European plan, involving the defense of six UN safe areas. In a culmination of international passiveness, it was expected that deploying UN peacekeepers with limited air support somehow would deter further Serb attacks (Henriksen 2007: 96-97).

Meanwhile, UNSCR 781 of 9 October 1992 had opened for a no-fly zone (NFZ) over Bosnia-Herzegovina, and at the North Atlantic Council (NAC) meeting of 18 October, Secretary-General Manfred Wörner reported that Hungary and Austria would provide airborne early warning systems (AWACS) for the NFZ (Owen 1996: 59, 63). While this realized a system for reporting NFZ violations, enforcement by regular combat patrols was still missing as the situation worsened in Bosnia, over the course of spring 1993. The VRS launched new attacks against Sarajevo and Srebrenica, and amidst Western condemnations, NATO was propelled towards a larger commitment. When the UN authorized military enforcement of the NFZ in

late March, NATO launched Operation Deny Flight (NATO.int 1993a). This commitment, in various forms, would last for the remainder of the conflict.

The Clinton administration continued to ask for more military pressure throughout the summer of 1993, including expanding the NATO air effort to direct military strikes (Henriksen 2007: 97). Their determination secured British cooperation, but France remained hesitant to NATO military action. Thus, in a 2 August NAC meeting, a “dual key” system was engineered, wherein both the U.S.-dominated NATO, and the UN with its European-dominated UNPROFOR, had to approve incoming requests for close air support (CAS) and airstrikes (Henriksen 2007: 98). Reluctant towards lasting commitment, using airpower seemed the best option for the NATO governments. Despite their often limited and context-dependent effectiveness, air forces are also easily suspended and withdrawn, and with a scarcity of Serb anti-air defenses, it was a relatively safe option. Furthermore, the Serbs could not retaliate directly, as NATO airfields were located far from the theater of operations (Switzer 2001: 302). Hence chances of allied casualties were low, the operation could be executed quickly, and high-level political and military control was possible. On the other hand, the operation’s limitations included covering its economic expenses, problems with targeting, and potential collateral damage. Furthermore, the “dual key” system often meant that UNPROFOR commanders were either denied CAS in critical situations, or that the authorization process would take so long that by the time it was approved, the request was no longer valid (Switzer 2001: 302). Finally, potential or actual hostage-taking of UN or national personnel often deterred NATO airstrikes; 350 peacekeepers were for example held hostage in May 1995, while 55 Dutch personnel were taken in July (Switzer 2001: 294).

The diplomatic initiative so far had mainly been the UN-European Community (EC) International Conference on the former Yugoslavia (ICFY), established by the London Conference on 26-27 August 1992 (Owen 1996: 2). Attempting to find a negotiated settlement, the ICFY resulted in the Vance-Owen Peace Plan (VOPP), which entailed that Bosnia-Herzegovina should be organized as a decentralized state with significant functions delegated to a number of ethnically divided regions, meanwhile Sarajevo would be demilitarized (Owen 1996: 65-68). Consistent with their new approach, the U.S. threatened the Bosnian Serbs to accept the VOPP; implicitly suggesting that NATO airstrikes might commence otherwise, meanwhile economic sanctions would be tightened. It was generally perceived that the threat of tightening the sanctions worked well to make Serbian leadership both inclined to accept the VOPP, and to pressure the Bosnian Serbs to do the same (George

1994: 1-2). The attempt was also explicitly supported by the UN, and even Russia. Milošević, under heavy pressure from the international sanctions, thus came to favor the VOPP, and laid further pressure on the Bosnian Serb leadership to follow suit (Jakobsen 1998: 86-87). Consequently, on 2 May Karadžić signed the VOPP in Athens, with a prerequisite for further ratification by the Bosnian Serb Assembly in Pale.

This ratification session began on 5 May. Karadžić hesitantly argued that the primary interest of the Bosnian Serbs had been security, and that this had been guaranteed by the VOPP, as only UNPROFOR troops could enter Serb majority enclaves. Simultaneously, the plan would consolidate some, if not all, of the newfound Serb landgains. According to Ćosić however, Karadžić had done the utmost to take a neutral stand, aiming to preserve his political position (Owen 1996: 163-164). The response was lukewarm, and Mladić had, to great effect, voiced strong opposition. Although he earlier had supposedly been warned by VJ officers that failure to ratify would cause interruption in the flow of supplies, given that these officers, not fully under Milošević's control, remained supportive of Mladić, it is doubtful whether he ever got this warning (Owen 1996: 165). The VJ, like Mladić, was unhappy with the VOPP's proposals. Krajišnik, also strongly opposed, had then stopped the public debate before a vote could be held. Later that night, discussions continued in a closed session, where Milošević frankly expressed his frustration over the Bosnian Serb resistance (Owen 1996: 163).

Soon after, splits appeared between Bosnian Serb leadership on the one hand, and Milošević on the other (Owen 1995: 292). The Serbian president's waning influence in Pale became clear as it was decided that ratification would be settled by a referendum on 15-16 May. As a recipe for failure, an overwhelming majority then favored rejecting the VOPP. The U.S. failed to follow up this decision with the promised punitive measures, perhaps due to opposition to the plan from U.S. official circles, including President Clinton, Warren Christopher, and Chairman Colin Powell and his Joint Chiefs of Staff (Holbrooke 1998: 52; Jakobsen 1998: 90). The VOPP and its hopes for peace began to disintegrate.

Analysis

In the second sub-case, while the outcome is considered another failure, proportionality is classified positively. Further, reciprocity must be coded negative, as must credibility. The central objective had been making the Pale Assembly accept the VOPP. The peace-plan entailed moderately limited type B requirements, demanding that the Bosnian Serbs give up

some territory already under VRS control (Owen 1995: 133). As for the coercive tools, although the NFZ largely caused the VRS to abandon fixed-wing aircraft, these had never been critical to its ground-based, heavy weapons strategy (Jakobsen 1998: 84). The latter could likely easily have been targeted after the expansion of Deliberate Force, which would have struck at the heart of the VRS' operational center of gravity. Some have therefore argued that had the "lift and strike" been implemented effectively, war termination would have occurred sooner, because while the VRS could sustain limited CAS, wider airstrikes would have caused the Bosnian Serbs significant damage (Cigar 2001; Owen 1995: 291-292). In conclusion, had the threats been realized, the costs of noncompliance would probably have been critically unbearable, despite the lack of reciprocal benefits.

The low risks associated with airpower are often argued to enhance the West's credibility, and this was also the case in Bosnia (de Wijk 2005: 20). However, UN resistance and the "dual key" system made NATO CAS and airstrikes less credible to significantly hurt the VRS. Furthermore, the vulnerability of UNPROFOR significantly undermined the credibility of the "lift and strike" threat, as UN and European opposition was guaranteed. The Clinton administration's faltering behavior, including its weak support for the VOPP, further compounded this development (Jakobsen 1998: 88). Finally, difficulties in covering the expenses of the operation lowered the perceived chance that NATO would actually carry out the wider strikes.

For the Bosnian Serb domestic factors, all the variables are considered negative. For the Pale Assembly, supporting the VOPP would entail strong domestic ramifications, as was clear from the people's wholesale rejection of the plan. Conversely, continuing their hugely successful war effort could make the benefits of noncompliance significant. For Milošević, supporting the VOPP would expose him to criticism from the radicals, and lose him support in the militia and the paramilitaries (Owen 1995: 174). Nevertheless, tighter sanctions could have been even worse, as his support in the economic system might have failed. As shown in table 4.1, of the entire conflict, 1993 brought Serbia the worst economic recession. A further deterioration could easily have threatened Milošević's grip on power. The sanctions were therefore critical in gaining his support for the peace-plan (Owen 1995: 144). In turn, Milošević's opposition to the Bosnian Serb leadership could have caused large economic costs for the latter, which was reliant on Belgrade's financial support. Nevertheless, following the VOPP's failure and Milošević's ensuing need for political support, he was compelled to

acquiesce to the radicals' demand of supporting the *prečani*. Hence there were eventually few economic costs for Pale in this sub-case.

The VOPP's use of only UN peacekeepers probably satisfied Karadžić's security needs, who therefore did not resist significantly. Nevertheless, his need for political survival ultimately triumphed, preventing his direct support. Furthermore, Mladić's opposition was unsurprising, as compliance would have entailed peace at a time when the VRS, implicitly backed by the VJ, could advance with virtual impunity. Compromising would have weakened his position in the military, and it also countered his personal vision of a Greater Serbia. Furthermore, a demilitarization of Sarajevo was unacceptable to both the former two, and especially to Krajišnik, who ultimately blocked the public vote. Unfortunately, even though Milošević now opposed the Bosnian Serb decision, his influence in Pale was no longer significant enough to sway the outcome.

4.3.3 The Siege of Sarajevo

In August 1993 NATO was faced with yet another mounting crisis, as the VRS tightened their grip on Sarajevo. Though having long been under pressure, the city's lines of supplies and utilities had been severed in late July, when the VRS took control of two peaks surrounding the city, Mt. Igman and Mt. Bjelašnica (The New York Times 1993a). According to Lord Owen (1995: 205), the VRS operation was not directed against the city itself, which could have been forcibly taken at any point over the past 18 months, but was meant to pressure Army of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (ARBiH) elements in the area. Nevertheless, in response to a perceived imminent crisis, on 2 August NATO warned of: *"...immediate preparations for undertaking, in the event that the strangulation of Sarajevo [...] continues[,] stronger measures including air strikes against those responsible..."* (NATO.int 1993b). This threat of wider airstrikes met strong opposition both from certain UN commanders and some NATO member states, concerned for the security of their UNPROFOR personnel (Owen 1995: 210-211).

Despite Alliance disagreements, Karadžić offered to have the VRS withdraw, given that UN forces would move in and take control of the area. Milošević, no longer holding much influence with the Bosnian Serbs, suggested that both Karadžić and Krajišnik would be needed to persuade the ever more headstrong Mladić to give up Mt. Igman (Owen 1995: 208-209). At first, NATO disregarded the suggestion by reiterating its threat on 9 August,

although now not making the threat directly conditional on withdrawal. Additionally, it underlined the need for UN approval, because their threat was meant as support for UNSCR 770, 776, and 836 (NATO.int 1993c). These resolutions entailed demands for an immediate cease-fire, the respect of the safe areas and humanitarian efforts, the withdrawal of Serb security forces from Bosnia-Herzegovina, and progress towards a negotiated settlement (UNSCR 836 1993). The renewed threat triggered Karadžić to issue a counter-threat, warning of full-scale war should airstrikes be executed. Regardless, the growing importance of the two politicians was demonstrated as Karadžić and Krajišnik soon after persuaded Mladić to pull back, while UN forces replaced the VRS, to safeguard against ARBiH counter-offensives (The New York Times 1993a). Unwilling to escalate the matter further, the NATO governments accepted UN demilitarization of Mt. Igman, and meanwhile some relief convoys were allowed into the besieged city, a new process of negotiation begun to put Sarajevo under UN administration (The New York Times 1993a, 1993c).

Analysis

The high degree of accommodation of the Bosnian Serbs makes it difficult to determine the outcome of this incident. However, the aim had been to relieve Sarajevo's suffering, and to some degree this was achieved, even though the VRS retained a tight grip on the city and incoming humanitarian assistance. Lord Owen (1995: 259) has argued that the *sine qua non* of the Serb withdrawal, including abandoning their positions and heavy weapons, was the UN safeguard deployment, preventing potential ARBiH counter-offensives. I will therefore consider this coercive effort a qualified success.

The coercive strategy warrants classifying both proportionality and reciprocity as positive, while credibility as negative. The central objective of ending the siege was a limited demand in-between type A and type B coercive diplomacy, and while it initially was conveyed with more clarity, NATO's aim remained the same throughout the incident. Had they been implemented effectively, wider airstrikes could, as earlier, have inferred great costs of noncompliance for the Bosnian Serbs, at least significant enough to compel the VRS off Mt. Igman. Next, the eventual acceptance of UN deployment worked as a "carrot", freeing VRS forces for other, potentially more harmful tasks, thus playing into the wishes of the Bosnian Serbs (Owen 1995: 208). This contributed to the benefits of compliance. Nevertheless, NATO's underlining of the need for UN approval was detrimental to the threat's credibility,

since several UN commanders had signaled their disapproval (The New York Times 1993b). This was further cemented by internal Alliance opposition.

As for the domestic factors, regime support and security is considered positive, as is also the economic calculus and the role of key actors. The fact that, according to Lord Owen, it was a Bosnian Serb political decision not to take Sarajevo, even though this could have been done relatively easily, suggests that Pale felt it had little to gain by taking the city forcibly. Instead, withdrawing from Mt. Igman probably resonated well with the Bosnian Serb public. Also the economic aspect was served well by complying, as it secured a UN substitute for its operation against the ARBiH. The termination of this operation, both cutting costs and freeing up the forces for other tasks, improved their economic situation. Finally, Milošević again acted as a “transmission belt” against Pale, but still to no significant effect. Regardless, Karadžić seemed to support the limited withdrawal, as long as his UN security guarantee was granted, and at this point even Krajišnik showed flexibility that he could accept a Muslim Sarajevo, should secession remain possible for the Republika Srpska (Owen 1995: 215-216). On a final note, the VRS’ preferences were also met, as their objective of preventing ARBiH counter-offensives was achieved.

4.3.4 The Markale Marketplace Massacre

A psychological shift swept the NATO countries in February and March 1994, following the impact of a presumably Serb bombshell in the Sarajevo Markale marketplace on 5 February, killing 68 (Henriksen 2007: 100). Western public opinion soared in favor of military action, effecting the first proper agreement between NATO and the UN on using airpower (NATO.int 1994e). On 9 February, to end the siege of Sarajevo, the NAC:

...call[ed] for the withdrawal, or regrouping and placing under UNPROFOR control, within ten days, of heavy weapons [...] of the Bosnian Serb forces located in an area within 20 kilometres of the centre of Sarajevo, and excluding an area within two kilometres of the centre of Pale (NATO.int 1994a)

Furthermore, additional aircraft and warships were dispatched to the region, giving the threat extra momentum (Jakobsen 1998: 94). Karadžić refused to yield, and once again issued counter-threats, including shooting down incoming NATO aircraft. Mladić seemingly *wanted* limited airstrikes, which could unite the now divided Serbs, and give him more freedom to act. He knew that as long as UNPROFOR remained, they were his safeguard against NATO

airpower escalating to the point where the military balance could turn against him (Owen 1995: 267, 292). Given the Alliance's newfound resolution, the stalemate situation became increasingly tense.

There had supposedly been made unsuccessful attempts to consult Russia before issuing the NATO ultimatum, but Russian representatives nevertheless showed frustration over the incident. In a last-minute rescue, aiming to gain a central role in handling the crisis, Russian president Boris Yeltsin on 16 February offered to place Russian peacekeepers in Sarajevo (Owen 1995: 267). This would prevent the ARBiH from launching future counter-offensives, and offered the VRS a chance to back down while saving face. Determined to avoid fighting the Russians, fellow VJ officers successfully pressured Mladić to concede, and a Sarajevo heavy weapons exclusion zone was engineered (Burg 2003: 60). In several ways, this incident proved a success for NATO, something the Alliance itself was quick to point out.

Analysis

Following the Markale incident, coercive diplomacy proved successful. NATO's choice of strategy entail that all associated variables are considered positive. The demands were limited and clear type B objectives; not for an immediate and comprehensive peace settlement, but for Mladić to withdraw from Sarajevo. It has been argued (c.f. Burg 2003) that NATO's repeated demands for a withdrawal from Sarajevo were insufficient, as they did not relate to ending the overall conflict. This is likely inaccurate. According to Lord Owen (1995: 256), negotiations with the Serbs were most constructive when developing an already agreed upon line of policy, and the "Sarajevo first" initiative was precisely this. On another note, the central and indeed unexpected, role played by Russia in this incident has often been neglected by Western observers (Jakobsen 1998: 95).

Given the unprecedented support for using airpower, the strikes threatened would probably have been so severe as to compel the VRS away from Sarajevo, increasing its costs of noncompliance. For the Bosnian Serbs however, removing their heavy weapons was highly difficult seen as an isolated concession, because they prevented potential advances by the more numerous ARBiH infantry divisions (Owen 1995: 256). The subsequent deployment of Russian peacekeepers reduced this cost and provided benefits of compliance, both by substituting for the counter-infantry safeguard, and by reducing the likelihood that NATO could later use full-scale airpower. Finally, the Bosnian Serbs were convinced of the

credibility of the threats due to the support of both the UN and the general public in NATO countries, the urgent deadline, and the additional forces dispatched (Jakobsen 1998: 94-95).

Also domestically all variables are considered positive, and also here the Russian intervention was central. After its peacekeepers had been deployed, Serb noncompliance would have meant making the Russian peacekeepers their enemies, which doubtlessly was a political impossibility in Pale. Instead, being able to publicly claim that they were working *with* the Russians would certainly secure support from most Bosnian Serbs. Next, while their economic calculation was not directly affected by this incident, it can be reasonable to consider that as even the VJ now opposed noncompliance, refusal could have lost the VRS the critical support still flowing from the former to the latter. Finally, while Mladić himself seemed inclined towards noncompliance, Lord Owen (1995: 255) explains how Karadžić was interested in serious negotiations over UN demilitarization of Sarajevo. Additionally, when also the VJ increased pressure against Mladić, it became difficult for him to resist any longer.

4.3.5 Assault at Goražde

By late March hostilities had reached the eastern Muslim enclave and UN safe area of Goražde. The ARBiH had used the city for launching new offensives, until the VRS counter-attacked on 29 March. After halting the Muslim offensives, the Serbs pushed the ARBiH back, all the way to Goražde itself (Jakobsen 1998: 97). As it seemed that the safe area was on the verge of falling to the VRS, NATO once more resorted to coercive diplomacy. On 10 and 11 April, two aircraft carried out three precision airstrikes, so-called “pinpricks”, against the assaulting Serb forces (NATO.int 1994d). In subsequent talks, the Bosnian Serbs were told to withdraw or face limited escalation of military measures (Burg 2003: 60). Krajišnik voiced strong opposition, now arguing that even the VRS’ withdrawal from Mt. Igman had been a mistake. He believed that in both cases, withdrawal damaged the Bosnian Serb negotiating position by not once and for all eliminating the ARBiH counter-offensive threat (Owen 1995: 273).

The promised escalation soon proved difficult however, as UN representatives blocked renewed NATO actions through the “dual key” system. Meanwhile, Bosnian Serb political authorities were making repeated promises to cease fighting, only to break these promises very quickly. In mid-April they followed up the NATO threat with a significant escalation of their own, taking 150 UN personnel hostage, seizing heavy weapons from a Sarajevo UN

collection-point, shelling the UN-administered Tuzla airport, and downing one British jet while damaging another (Jakobsen 1998: 97-98). The NATO governments, faced with dramatically increased costs, and lacking popular support at home, felt compelled to back down.

By 16 April the ARBiH offensives had been almost fully neutralized, and it seemed the VRS could overrun the town in a matter of days, had it so desired. Nevertheless, Pale ordered the withdrawal of the VRS from Goražde by 17 April. When this failed to happen, it was mainly due to recurring ARBiH skirmishes against VRS positions (Owen 1995: 273). Additionally, Bosnian Serb political leadership did not have full control over the army. By 18 April, U.S. diplomats had pressured UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali into requesting further NATO airstrikes, although NATO internal disagreements delayed its response a few days (NATO.int 1994c). When a compromise was reached on 22 April, NATO issued yet another ultimatum. It demanded that the VRS should immediately cease attacks against Goražde, and “...pull back three kilometres from the centre [...] of the city by 0001 GMT on 24th April...” (NATO.int 1994f). Additionally, in case of further attacks against any safe area, or “...after 0001 GMT on 27th April 1994, if any Bosnian Serb heavy weapons are within any designated military exclusion zone... [then] these weapons and other Bosnian Serb Military assets [...] will be subject to NATO air strikes” (NATO.int 1994b). The VRS complied with NATO’s demands (Jakobsen 1998: 98).

Meanwhile, the political mood was changing in Serbia. According to UN statistics, during 1992-1994 alone, Serbia received upwards of 1 million refugees from Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina (Cigar 2001: 230-231). Living conditions were deteriorating both as a result of this influx, and due to the economic recession. Hence, Serbia’s premier Mirko Marjanović (cited in Cigar 2001: 230-231) asserted in an August 1994 speech to the Serbian parliament that:

A great number of those refugees have been successful in Serbia, [achieving] a higher material standard and status than they had in the former Bosnia-Herzegovina, and many of them have profiteered from their emigration. The citizens of Serbia have seen that, and were often unhappy about it, and justifiably so.

On 4 August, the Serbian government broke most political and economic relations with Republika Srpska, and closed the border to all traffic except humanitarian aid (Owen 1995: 297).

Analysis

During the assault on Goražde, NATO's coercive diplomacy initially failed, before ultimately ending with success. The strategy of the coercer was marked by positive proportionality, while reciprocity was negative. However, also the credibility of the threat ultimately became positive. The main objective was a VRS pullback from Goražde; in itself a limited and clear type B demand. For the VRS however, the area surrounding Goražde was of key strategic priority (see section 4.2). Thus they strongly resisted the repeated ARBiH offensives in the region, as Bosnian Muslim control would infer very high costs. It was in this context that NATO executed the three "pinprick" strikes. Merely meant to signify resolve, they did not affect the military balance of the belligerents, leaving the VRS free to act as it wanted (Jakobsen 1998: 97).

Following the Serb escalation, and after some hesitation, NATO reiterated its threats, again in a clear and limited fashion. Empowered by Alliance resolve, it is likely that such wide-scale airstrikes could have caused the VRS the loss of their positions around Goražde; a dramatic increase in the costs of noncompliance (Jakobsen 1998: 98). Furthermore, despite practically no attempts at reciprocity in this exchange, the costs of withdrawing were relatively limited for the Serbs, seeing as the VRS aim to defeat the ARBiH offensives had largely been reached (Jakobsen 1998: 98). Lastly, the credibility of the strikes was demonstrated through NATO's willingness to specify exact conditions and deadlines, and eventually also by the request made by the UN Secretary-General.

With respect to the domestic variables, all are again classified as positive. The changing political situation in Serbia was no doubt reflected in the Republika Srpska. While the need to satisfy his radical political allies so far had guaranteed some acquiescence to the *prečani* ambitions, the new situation in Serbia allowed Milošević to bring renewed pressure against Pale. That Bosnian Serb leadership consequently became concerned for their political viability is illustrated in their decision to withdraw from Goražde. The critical, Serbian, economic support had been under threat, which further induced Pale towards a more accommodating line of policy. That this concern had been justified was demonstrated on 4

August, with the termination of the Serbia-Republika Srpska cooperation. Finally, the changing political environment in Pale caused key politicians to support the NATO demands, all the while Mladić and the VRS continued their attacks. However, following the very clear reiteration of the NATO threat, it is likely that also Mladić realized he could not hold out against wide-scale Alliance airstrikes, prompting him to withdraw voluntarily rather than being compelled to do so. In sum, as Krajišnik had stated, their aim had been to prevent Muslim counter-offensives, and once this objective was secured, the political mood changed to a more accommodating posture.

4.3.6 The Tuzla Shelling

Following the trans-Atlantic relationship-crisis in the autumn of 1994, the U.S. made a series of policy changes. In pursuit of an overall, negotiated settlement, they put more emphasis on positive inducements, and more closely coupling the “sticks” and the “carrots”. Renewed negotiations with both Milošević and the Bosnian Serbs ensued, while a larger degree of Russian cooperation was secured by shifting the diplomatic effort from the ICFY to the Contact Group (Burg 2003: 63-64). Nevertheless, in May 1995 Bosnian Serb forces took control of some heavy artillery from a depot inside the Sarajevo exclusion zone. It had now become evident that Mladić remained free to act as he saw fit; it was the politicians in Pale who had become dependent on him for leadership, not vice versa (Owen 1995: 320). In response, NATO struck a VRS ammunition dump near Pale on 25 and 26 May, reinforcing the demand that the VRS had to withdraw their heavy weapons from Sarajevo and observe an immediate cease-fire (Clark 2001: 49). The Bosnian Serbs again responded with escalation, with a retaliatory shelling of the city and safe area of Tuzla, killing a total of 75 people.

NATO, determined not to back down, executed new airstrikes, and again the Bosnian Serbs retaliated, taking over 350 UN personnel hostage (Holbrooke 1998: 63). This effectively put a stop to NATO’s attacks and punctured the UN effort in Bosnia-Herzegovina, at least until the arrival of the UN Rapid Reaction Force. With UN collapse also at the heavy weapons collection points, the VRS soon reclaimed hundreds of heavy weapons. Furthermore, the Bosnian Serbs now considered the UN hostile, triggering Karadžić to declare a state of war, formally handing over control of the government to the army. Such policy not only received support from the Serbian Orthodox Church and the VJ, but also generated significant inter-party unity between Bosnian Serb political parties (The New York Times 1995a, 1995b).

Eventually, the UN hostages were released unharmed, as rumors of a secret deal between local UN commanders and Bosnian Serbs representatives spread (Holbrooke 1998: 64-65). The latter received a number of concessions for freeing the captives, and NATO refrained from military action for weeks to come, even as the VRS violently stepped up its efforts. Soon after, negotiations failed between Milošević and U.S. Ambassador Robert Frasure, as Washington had refused to lift sanctions in return for Serbian recognition of Bosnia-Herzegovina. In sum, the incident amounted to nothing less than a “...*fiasco and [...] humiliation for the UN following the NATO airstrikes on Pale...*” (Owen 1995: 326).

Analysis

In this subcase, as no significant Serb concessions followed, the outcome was a failure. The coercer's strategy is marked by negative proportionality, but positive reciprocity. Credibility is difficult to classify, but is ultimately considered negative. Firstly, the demands made were the same as earlier; both specifically to withdraw from Sarajevo, and more generally to cease hostilities. While this constituted moderately limited type B objectives, the instruments employed were even more limited, as destroying an ammunition dump brought no immediate consequences for the VRS, only minimal long term effects. While the costs of noncompliance were limited significantly, surrendering their heavy weapons would entail large costs of compliance for the Serbs. Next, NATO's ensuing reluctance towards using force helped secure reciprocity, as did the new, general policy of equitable agreements. However, Milošević was not met with the same degree of reciprocity. Finally, credibility was secured by the actual strikes taking place with UN approval, but this changed when NATO failed to specify further consequences for continued noncompliance, meanwhile the UN hostages were held as human shields.

The internal politics and economy were characterized by classifying all variables negatively. Regime support and security was improved by noncompliance, as evident in the broad support the confrontational policies received. Furthermore, as Mladić remained a strong and popular leadership figure, increased army involvement in the Bosnian Serb government strengthened its viability. The refusal also benefitted them economically, considering both the VRS reclamation of heavy weapons, and the “carrots” secured by returning the hostages. Finally, although there remained visible disunity in-between Bosnian Serb leadership, the interests of most key actors pointed in the same direction; consolidating the current hold on Bosnian territory through a confrontational stance. This attitude characterized Krajišnik, Karadžić,

Mladić, the VJ, and the Church. The only alternative “transmission belt” could have been Milošević’s potential recognition of Bosnia, but the reserved U.S. attitude prevented this. With an ineffective Contact Group, and an absence of positive inducements, Milošević probably rather perceived his interests best served by a Serb force of arms.

4.3.7 Operation Deliberate Force

After the atrocities in Srebrenica and Žepa in July 1995, President Clinton realized it was better for U.S. forces to be involved proactively, rather than reactively, in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Burg 2003: 64). With the U.S. presidential elections coming up, the “endgame strategy” was engineered. It assumed that both U.S. and NATO credibility was linked to Bosnia’s future and that while the European UNPROFOR forces were either withdrawing or regrouping, the U.S. should deploy its own forces, on its own terms (Henriksen 2007: 103). Finally, the new approach would also grant the Bosnian Serbs a significant concession; a *de facto* recognition of the Republika Srpska (Owen 1995: 330).

Thus a far more conducive context and alliance coherence soon emerged. In late July and early August NATO threatened with “*substantial and decisive air power*” to halt attacks on Sarajevo and deter further attacks against Goražde, Bihać, and Tuzla (Jakobsen 1998: 101). Furthermore, the U.S. supported Croatian army, and the newly formed federation army, executed offensives against the VRS, capturing the Krajina region impressively effectively. Even though he had previously urged the secession of Krajina, Milošević refrained from intervening. Apathy was widespread in the Serbian public, and in a poll of its usually loyalist police force, 92% expressed opposition to serving outside Serbia (Cigar 2001: 228-229). The situation was even changing in Pale, where Karadžić’s recent loss of power gained Milošević newfound influence, while even Krajišnik became more flexible (Owen 1995: 330). Since August, Milošević had laid heavy pressure against Bosnian Serb leadership to transfer their rights of negotiation, so that he could seek an end to the conflict himself. In fact, this process was accomplished before NATO bombing commenced, as Milošević formally received these rights on 29 August (Cigar 2001: 210). Regardless, only one day earlier another mortar shell had landed in a Sarajevo market, producing 122 casualties. As Holbrooke on 27 August had threatened with a yearlong air campaign should hostilities not cease, NATO felt compelled to realize their threats (Henriksen 2007: 105). With UN support, and initially even Russian acquiescence, NATO initiated Operation Deliberate Force on 30 August.

The bombing campaign proved short, but effective; the total number of sorties roughly equaled one busy day of the Gulf War (Burg 2003: 67). Deliberate Force involved 220 fighter- and 70 support-aircraft, in addition to naval air assets based on the U.S. aircraft carrier *Theodore Roosevelt*. 3,535 sorties were executed, expending some 1,026 high-explosive munitions against 338 aim points on 48 Bosnian Serb targets (Henriksen 2007: 117). Primarily military assets were targeted, including a few artillery positions, a barracks, command and control nodes, logistical systems, some lines and centers of communication, and even some bridges. The attacks caused only limited damage to the VRS however, which was quite easily repaired. Although VRS capacities for maneuver and command and control were somewhat degraded, the main effect of the bombing seems to have been psychological; a further reduction in the already poor Serb morale (Owen 1995: 340). Significant political restrictions ensured that major VRS troop concentrations were not targeted, in order to keep Serb casualties as low as possible. Bosnian Serb leadership was also ruled out as legitimate targets. As most of the initially approved targets soon had been hit, extending the target list proved strenuous with considerable European opposition (Cigar 2001: 221).

On 1 September NATO halted its attacks, giving the Bosnian Serbs time to comply with the UN demands (NATO.int 1995d). The following day, NATO Secretary-General Willy Claes (NATO.int 1995c) underlined that especially, NATO demanded:

[N]o Bosnian Serb attacks on Sarajevo or other Safe Areas; Bosnian Serb withdrawal of heavy weapons from the 20 km total exclusion zone around Sarajevo without delay; [and] complete freedom of movement for UN forces and personnel and NGOs and unrestricted use of Sarajevo airport

Furthermore, he stated that so far, “[t]he reply of General Mladić is not sufficient and does not constitute a basis for terminating air strikes”. As further Serb concessions were not forthcoming, the attacks resumed on 5 September (NATO.int 1995b). Meanwhile, U.S. diplomats offered Milošević a comprehensive peace-deal, including lifting the sanctions against Serbia. Their military effort was concertedly stepped up when 13 Tomahawk cruise-missiles impacted in Banja Luka on 10 September, and the new, so-called “Option 3” target list was being considered (Owen 1995: 334). Finally, as federation ground forces became increasingly organized, further offensives routed whole VRS units, allowing the federation quick and significant landgains (Cigar 2001: 220-223). On the other hand, it should be noted that these advances did not yet constitute a Bosnian Serb defeat. Lord Owen (1995: 336-339)

argues that the VRS withdrawals were less costly than at first believed, and that as the Serbs were falling back to more defensible lines, the withdrawal may have been engineered to secure the Serb negotiating position. Additionally, by selectively offering or restricting the federation forces air support, NATO prevented unproportional exploitations of the Serb fallbacks. Four days after the Banja Luka attack, the UN and NATO demands were met as “*Bosnian Serb military and political leaders sign[ed] an agreement to withdraw...*” (NATO.int 1995a).

Holbrooke secured a cease-fire by 5 October, and on 31 October Milošević, Izetbegović, and Tudman met at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base outside Dayton, Ohio, where they ultimately signed the Dayton Accords (Henriksen 2007: 105). It has been argued that the wording of the agreement was deliberately left ambiguous, so that each party could claim success domestically, securing the current leadership’s power (Switzer 2001: 296). Dayton established Bosnia-Herzegovina as an indivisible and decentralized state with two separate, internal entities; the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Republika Srpska, and both were granted significant autonomous powers. The talks hence granted significant concessions to the Bosnian Serbs, who remained in control over a controversial 49% of Bosnia (Williams 2001: 279).

Analysis

The outcome of Operation Deliberate Force was ultimately a success; the war ended and negotiations took place. The coercer’s strategy can be considered with positive values for all variables. First of all, the demand that Milošević accept cease-fire and negotiations were moderately limited type B objectives. Though entailing some VRS withdrawals, the proposals would also consolidate much Serb control of Bosnian territory. While the coercive means remained relatively limited, they were strong enough to incur considerable costs of noncompliance. Although Milošević had been ready to negotiate for some time, Pale had on repeated occasions shown that it was not. So far, Milošević had not had enough influence with the Bosnian Serbs to affect their stance, but this changed with the professionalization of the Croat and federation armies, which made the costs of continued noncompliance much higher for the Bosnian Serbs. As Jović noted (cited in Cigar 2001: 218):

...with the unavoidable military strengthening of the adversary, the Serbs of Bosnia-Herzegovina may reach the point where they are defeated, and where they lose that which they have conquered...

The sudden capture of Krajina probably suggested to the Bosnian Serbs that this fear could become reality. When they turned to Milošević for support, they found little; his interests were cooperation with the international community, ending the war, and ultimately lifting the sanctions. Milošević considered that the role of Balkan peacemaker would increase legitimacy domestically, fortify his position and hedge against ICTY indictments (Cigar 2001: 230). For these reasons, when the marketplace shelling triggered strong NATO reactions, the costs of noncompliance soared for the Bosnian Serbs. Pale realized the urgent need for negotiations, and conceded to Milošević's demands for negotiating powers.

When Deliberate Force launched, the Serb negotiating position was significantly weakened, and instead of retaliating, they took shelter and waited. In all probability, they judged the credibility of a protracted NATO engagement as low, rather expecting the international community to make a favorable offer to quickly end the conflict (Owen 1995: 331). Furthermore, the costs of noncompliance were initially limited, as most of NATO's targets would cause only long-term effects, no direct, tactical consequences. Finally, because Clinton needed a free agenda before the upcoming elections, the Serbs reinforced their perception (Cigar 2001: 221; Switzer 2001: 302).

When several factors then convened, the Serb perception of both the costs of noncompliance and NATO's credibility began to change. Firstly, the relative extensiveness of NATO's campaign proved beyond the typical international military response, countering Serb expectations and analytical paradigms (Cigar 2001: 221). Next, the federation ground offensive successfully blocked and interrupted VRS maneuverability. It forced the Bosnian Serb forces into concentrated formations designed to halt the federation advances, but which simultaneously exposed them to the full effect of the NATO airstrikes (Henriksen 2007:113-114). Soon the Serb forces became tired and on the defensive, increasingly outnumbered, and struggling with low morale and discipline (Switzer 2001: 302). Meanwhile, NATO escalation was suggested by the potential "Option 3" list, both horizontally to include key areas like Banja Luka, as signaled by the Tomahawk strikes, and vertically to systematically include fielded forces and/or main supply routes (Cigar 2001: 222).

As the NATO countries began linking their own credibility to the success of their mission, their resolve became apparent for the Serbs. Furthermore, because the UN had approved the campaign and reconfigured its forces in more defensible positions, the costs of executing the threat were lowered, improving NATO's credibility. Despite political restrictions on the airstrikes, evidence suggests that the Serbs felt faced with significant uncertainty, and that the future costs of continued bombing could become even greater than the current ones. This was evident when Serbian media reported that Milošević, having met with Holbrooke, both personally believed, and persuaded Pale likewise, that the bombing would continue relentlessly until a cease-fire was signed (Cigar 2001: 222). When Milošević later congratulated then U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff member General Clark with NATO's victory, Clark objected that it had been the federation who had secured the victory. Responding, Milošević famously remarked: "*No. It was your NATO, your bombs and missiles, your high technology that defeated us. We Serbs never had a chance against you*" (Clark 2001: 68).

Finally, reciprocity was secured both towards Serbia and the Bosnian Serbs. Milošević was offered a loosening of the crippling sanctions, and could play the peacemaker card domestically. Meanwhile, Mladić had avoided withdrawing his heavy weapons because this would expose the VRS to ARBiH counter-offensives. When NATO made clear, however, that it would not allow an unproportional Muslim counter-offensive, Mladić complied with the demand to withdraw (Owen 1995: 334-337). Additionally, another significant "carrot" was the *de facto* partition of Bosnia, securing the ultimate Bosnian Serb goal; their own, semi-autonomous political entity, the Republika Srpska (Cigar 2001: 231-232).

Turning to the domestic factors of Serbia, who now held the powers of negotiation, all factors are also classified positively. While the preceding discussion answered why the Bosnian Serb operational center of gravity collapsed, this is only half the answer to how coercive diplomacy succeeded. The other half must address why also the strategic center of gravity, i.e. the support of Milošević and Belgrade, failed. In other words, why did Milošević not try to even out the military balance prior to negotiations? Contrary to U.S. expectations, Milošević did little or nothing while the Bosnian Serbs were heading for defeat (Cigar 2001: 227).

One explanation is that the required escalation would have had to be major. Rather than just providing limited assistance, Serbia would have been required to call upon the full force of the VJ in a quagmire war it might not have won. The army was already troubled by low support and mobilization response. Dramatically increasing the military effort would have had

a high price, both in casualties and in economic and political terms. Had the fragile Serbian society been subjected to such burdens, the pillars upholding it could have collapsed (Cigar 2001: 227-228). In sum, to quote Dr. Cigar (2001: 229): “...*Milošević assessed the cost of a full-scale war might be so high as to potentially destabilize his government*”. Continuing supporting the *prečani* involved costs Milošević was unable to take, costs which would have fuelled Serbia’s internal political opposition. The Serbian public had generally turned against the foreign Serbs, who were considered warmongering extremists, exploiting Serbia’s support to accomplish their own goals. On the other hand, a quick peace could be considered a Serbian victory; it could be claimed that Greater Serbia’s borders had been secured, and that the country’s economic future was brightened (Cigar 2001: 230).

Next, the economic calculus also favored conceding. Defiance and escalation would entail high costs for the military operations themselves, and would cause further disruption of the Serbian economy through continued international sanctions. On the other hand, complying brought a loosening of the sanctions, and cut the auxiliary costs for the ongoing war.

Finally, as Serbia was becoming increasingly isolated politically and strategically, key Serbian actors began to realize Moscow’s unwillingness and inability to support the Serb cause (Cigar 2001: 229). Simultaneously, the VRS was unable to hold captured territory, and began falling back to more defensible lines. Cut off from direct Serbian support, it no longer enjoyed clear military superiority. Finally, when the priority area of Banja Luka came under attack, the VRS accepted it no longer held the initiative. It thus became a “transmission belt”, demanding a cease-fire consolidating the remainder of its territory. Also Mladić, now more quiet and reflected, accepted the need to back down; his support in the army was undermined as his soldiers dreaded serving in Bosnia, and draft dodging and deserting became an issue. Finally, even the most radical politicians in Pale realized that the semi-autonomous Republika Srpska was the best offer they would get. Thus the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina came to an end, bringing an uneasy peace that nevertheless remains today.

5 Kosovo

This chapter presents and analyzes NATO's use of coercive diplomacy in the 1998-1999 Kosovo conflict. It includes a total of five sub-cases, organized as in the preceding chapter. Firstly, however, the sources of conflict and the key actors and elites are discussed. Because this case in many ways is connected to the former, some repetition is unavoidable. Nevertheless, I will here try to focus on that which changed since the Bosnian war.

5.1 Sources of Conflict

To the south of Serbia lies the region of Kosovo, a small area with a predominantly Albanian population. Under Tito, Kosovo had been granted status as an autonomous province within Serbia, a status since revoked by Belgrade in 1989, as the Serbian government introduced a strict police regime with extensive cultural oppression and harassment of ethnic Albanians (Clark 2001: 110). Much enmity between the Kosovar Albanians and the Kosovo Serbs stemmed from both groups' overlapping historical and territorial claims. Both trace important historical developments and events to the area, and a large population of ethnic Albanians have long considered Kosovo their home (Burg 2003: 71). On the other hand, Serbs often argue that the Serbian nation originated within Kosovo itself, and that its capital city of Pristina is the very cradle of the Serb civilization (Owen 1996: 63). Kosovo was also the scene for some of their most important historical-mythological events, including the Turkish victory over the Serbs on Kosovo Field in 1389 (Holbrooke 1998: 23).

It is fair to say these developments were given relatively little attention in early international efforts at dealing with the SFRY break-up. When Kosovo, unlike Bosnia, avoided war in the immediately following years, it was largely due to the peaceful methods of the Albanian leadership, including Ibrahim Rugova and his newly established Democratic League of Kosovo (LDK) (Henriksen 2007: 123). Their view was like that of most Kosovar Albanians; that Kosovo should be independent. The drawback to their peaceful approach was that it failed to grab the attention of the international community, who instead were drawn to Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

As their bid for independence failed, Kosovo's young population turned to increasingly radical measures, and following the Dayton Accords, many estimated that violence was the only way to protect group interests in Yugoslavia. Soon, a Kosovar Albanian grouping known

as the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) carried out its first acts of violence, killing five Serbs on 22 April 1996 (BBC 2003a). With an unrestricted flow of weapons from the neighboring, chaos-stricken Albania, many Kosovars quickly gave the organization their support, thus undermining Rugova and the LDK (Burg 2003: 70). This was but the beginning of a series of attacks and counter-attacks between the KLA on the one hand, and Serb police forces, Serbian Interior Ministry Police (MUP), and other Serb security elements on the other (Henriksen 2007: 125-129).

5.2 Elites and Key Actors

In the same manner as in the previous chapter, this section will deal with the key political and societal actors of the coerced. As noted earlier, I will here focus on the changes since the war in Bosnia.

Slobodan Milošević and the Serbian Government

Unfortunately, there is relatively little information available on the concrete calculations underpinning Milošević's decision-making during the Kosovo crisis, but some inferences can be made by assuming him a rational actor (Burg 2003: 70). Since the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Milošević's political position had become increasingly vulnerable. In December 1996, after Milošević's party, the Socialist Party of Serbia (SPS), was caught in apparent election fraud, hundreds of thousands of protesters took to Belgrade's streets, demanding more democracy (Holbrooke 1998: 345). Additionally, having served two consecutive periods, Milošević was no longer eligible as President of Serbia, instead taking the role as President of the FRY. Given their weakened situation, the SPS and Milošević were yet again forced to play the nationalist card, and on 24 March 1998 they formed a coalition government with Milošević's wife's political party, Yugoslav Left (JUL), and the extreme nationalist Vojislav Šešelj's party, the Serbian Radical Party (SRS). This strengthened Milošević's position in the Serbian parliament and gave him useful, radical political allies, an important source of support as the Kosovo crisis was growing (Henriksen 2007: 133). Nevertheless, and perhaps especially due to his newfound alliances, Milošević remained the *de facto* Serbian decision-maker (Henriksen 2007: 168).

Arguably, Milošević had at least some incentive to find a negotiated settlement over Kosovo, since Dayton had only partially lifted the international economic sanctions against the FRY. If

he could demonstrate a commitment to democracy, and yet again play the peaceful negotiator in Kosovo, perhaps also the remaining sanctions could be lifted (BBC 2003a). This would further his progress towards an international recognition of the integrity and legitimacy of the remaining territory of the FRY, i.e. the republics of Serbia and Montenegro.

Having said that however, the special relevance and emotional importance that Kosovo held for Milošević is difficult to overstate. According to Cyrus Vance (Owen 1996: 59), willingness to negotiate over Kosovo was at the very edge of Milošević's flexibility. After all, Kosovo had been the vehicle of Milošević's rise to power (see section 4.2), and the radical hardliners in Serbia were well aware of this. Giving up Serbia's claim to Kosovo would be for Milošević to butcher his own sacred cow, which would fuel domestic opposition. Those Western observers who considered Kosovo a "second Bosnia" failed to grasp the area's great significance for Serb history. It is sometimes said that in the Balkans, a grief can be held for centuries. Though the saying is clearly meant proverbially, the Serb defeat on Kosovo Field in 1389 is nevertheless a case in point. For the Serbs, once more handing over Kosovo to its Muslim population would have entailed a repeat and renewal of this perceived humiliation. While this is no justification for the Serb aggression, it is an account of how many Serbs felt at the time of the Kosovo crisis.

Serbian Radicals – Vojislav Šešelj and the SRS

The radicals' relevance in Serbian politics had somewhat decreased since the conflict in Bosnia. From controlling almost a fourth of the seats in the national assembly, the SRS now held little more than a tenth (IPU.org). Nevertheless, this also meant a concentration of the true hardliners, and made the SRS a blackmailing fringe-party with relatively little political responsibility. Thus, obtaining their acquiescence remained important to Milošević, lest his vulnerable position be exposed to the radicals' ordnance.

Albanian Political Actors – The LDK and the KLA

Ibrahim Rugova had in 1989 been one of the founding members of the LDK, a right-wing political party that championed a peaceful struggle for Kosovo's independence. In the mid-nineties, with the LDK having failed to secure this goal, the KLA began to gain in popularity. As the crisis unfolded, Rugova and the LDK became increasingly unpopular with most Kosovars, spawning mass demonstrations in the streets of Kosovo. To secure his political

survival, Rugova was compelled to quit opposing the KLA and its actions (Burg 2003: 76). The KLA, on the other hand, was a Kosovar Albanian nationalist organization. It demanded full independence, and did not shy away from any methods considered constructive, carrying out executions and raids against Serb security elements and civilians alike. For this reason, the NATO governments largely recognized the KLA as a terrorist group until spring 1998. For a long time, the number of actual KLA hardliners was quite low, despite substantial indirect support from a significant portion of the Kosovar population (Henriksen 2007: 125). As the peaceful policies of the LDK failed however, the ever more radicalized youth increasingly turned to the KLA (BBC 2003a).

The organization's strategy for Kosovar independence soon became evident. According to a political adviser to the Kosovo Verification Mission (KVM) head, the KLA deliberately sought to provoke the Serbs into aggressive counter-measures by attacking their personnel. In turn, this could make Western opinion more sympathetic to the Kosovar cause. According to KLA commander RRustem "Remi" Mustafa, his organization *"...didn't have the fire power to carry out any major actions. But it was easy to provoke the Serbs. We did it by just using snipers. Our aim was to get NATO to intervene as soon as possible"* (BBC 2003a).

Their strategy soon succeeded. In spring 1998, a change was noticeable in U.S. and NATO attitudes towards the KLA. Not only did Western diplomats actively seek contact with KLA representatives, but U.S. diplomats even implicitly hinted at NATO support (Henriksen 2007: 142). This boost of confidence induced the KLA towards an ever more confrontational approach, renewing their offensive efforts. Some evidence even suggests direct cooperation between the West and NATO on the one side, and the KLA on the other. Following the 1998 October Agreements, the KVM supposedly supplied the KLA with maps and even left behind communications equipment (BBC 2003a). Thus KLA would supply NATO with military intelligence, targeting information, and damage assessment reports. In effect, said then Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe, General Sir Rupert Smith, NATO effectively allied itself with the KLA (Henriksen 2007: 157-158).

5.3 NATO Coercive Diplomacy

By February 1998, the KLA had mounted significant resistance to Serbian control over Kosovo. Resultantly, Serb police unleashed a wave of violence, triggering U.S. Special Representative Robert Gelbard to condemn both the police violence and, in a soon-to-become

controversy, the KLA terrorist acts (Burg 2003: 75-76). The Western members of the Contact Group stressed the need to re-impose economic sanctions against Serbia, but Russia resisted., New sanctions were nevertheless enacted in March, adding further strain to the already pressured Serbian economy (BBC 2003a). Frustrated by the slow progress of the international community, the U.S. and its allies within the Contact Group were convinced quick, decisive, and even forceful action was needed against Milošević, and therefore sought to make NATO the primary crisis management engine for Kosovo (Henriksen 2007: 131). Furthermore, given the relatively quick settlement after only a few days of bombing in Bosnia, it was widely believed that also this time Milošević would fold quickly under credible military threats or actual bombing (Henriksen 2007: 109-119). Already by May 1998 the White House had considered NATO airstrikes, meanwhile other Alliance political leaders drafted a UNSCR calling for all necessary means to resolve the growing crisis (Burg 2003: 77; The New York Times 1999b).

In the following five sub-cases, I will as before first present relevant empirical data, before these are analyzed in terms of the theoretical variables. The five sub-cases discussed are Operation Determined Falcon, the October Agreements, the Rambouillet Conference, and Operation Allied Force, which for analytical purposes is split in two parts.

5.3.1 Operation Determined Falcon

On 28-29 May 1998 NATO foreign ministers met in Luxembourg to discuss the situation in Kosovo. A statement was issued expressing concern for the developments, encouraging dialogue between the parties. The document stated that NATO's major goal in the region was "*a peaceful resolution of the crisis...*", as "[t]he status quo is unsustainable" (NATO.int 1998). Importantly, Secretary-General Javier Solana (cited in Henriksen 2007: 136) expressed that NATO "*will consider further deterrent measures, if the violence continues. Let me stress, nothing is excluded*". Although Solana used the word deterrent, this still constitutes coercive diplomacy as defined in the thesis' framework, because the aim was to change the *status quo*, rather than to preserve it.

As violence continued unabated in early June, NATO issued another warning, preparing for "*a full range of options [...] [for] halting or disrupting a systematic campaign of violent repression and expulsion in Kosovo*" (cited in Henriksen 2007: 138). They sought to support a cessation of violence, while generating negotiations for a lasting political settlement.

Meanwhile, in the UNSC, Russia had openly opposed using force, thus denying NATO a UN mandate. There were also internal disagreements in the Alliance on the desirability of using force (Jakobsen 2007: 239). Nevertheless, on 16 June Operation Determined Falcon was initiated; a NATO air exercise over Albania and Macedonia, it was meant as a demonstration of NATO's potential in projecting airpower (Clark 2001: 123). While the exercise served to cement the contemporary axiom that airpower was the superior instrument of force projection, its relative lack of potency has been pointed out by amongst others Chairman of the NATO Military Committee General Klaus Naumann. He admitted that the exercise proved nothing to Milošević except that NATO needed more than 48 hours to prepare for any serious projection of airpower (Henriksen 2007: 139).

According to now NATO SACEUR General Clark (2001:123-124), further diplomatic initiatives were taken in mid-June, when the U.S. dispatched Richard Holbrooke, Christopher Hill, and Robert Gelbard to meet with both Serb and KLA representatives, after realizing that a political settlement excluding the KLA would be meaningless. Following the subsequent, secret talks, Holbrooke was quoted by KLA international spokesman Bardhyl Mahmuti to have said that the U.S. would “...*impose constitutional changes on Milošević which in 3 to 5 years will bring independence to Kosovo*”, something Holbrooke later partly verified (BBC 2003a). On the other hand, airpower analyst Dag Henriksen (2007: 146) claims, finding support in other academics, that most other NATO members at this point agreed that Kosovo was an integral part of Serbia. For this group, both the independence and partition options were considered too volatile, considering the fragile peace in Bosnia. Thus the only acceptable alternative left was an arrangement with Kosovar autonomy, as a province within Serbia.

Milošević, meanwhile, was facing problems on the domestic front. The VJ, still not entirely under presidential control, was resisting the dirty work in Milošević's plan for Kosovo (Clark 2001: 114). Therefore, and also due to the NATO warnings, in the first half of June Milošević stepped down the Serb security efforts in the contested Drenica Valley (Henriksen 2007: 143). Their confidence raised by the perceived Western support, the KLA soon escalated the level of conflict. With the Serbs on the defensive, the KLA quickly seized the opportunity and captured what territory the Serbs had withdrawn from. At the apex of this early summer offensive, the KLA held around 40% of the province. In late summer this ignited another round of Serb counter-offensives, bringing excessive aggression and

repression against both the KLA and the civilian population amongst which it hid. Ultimately, some 200,000 Kosovars were internally displaced by early August (BBC 2003a).

Analysis

The first coercive diplomacy attempt in Kosovo should be considered a failure; NATO did not secure a peaceful resolution, and instead the crisis escalated. Initially, the main reason for the escalation was not Serbian noncompliance, but NATO's lack of leverage over the KLA, which would have prevented the latter from exploiting the favorable situation. Considering the coercer's strategy, proportionality is ultimately considered negative, as is also reciprocity and credibility. Ending the Serb campaign was limited, type A coercive diplomacy, and as the costs of compliance were low, Milošević initially conceded. As the KLA was strengthened by its summer offensive however, a peaceful resolution became an extensive and costly demand for Milošević and the Serbs. Exactly what a "resolution" entailed remained unclear, as did the instruments NATO might use (Henriksen 2007: 147). Considering that the West had signaled at least limited support for Kosovo's independence, Milošević probably perceived very high costs of compliance. On the other hand, Determined Falcon brought only weak threatening signals and no consequences of noncompliance. Next, no attempts were made at promising the Serbs positive inducements, meaning that the lack of benefits of compliance further compounded the Serb decision to resist (Jakobsen 2007: 242). Finally, credibility was undermined as the Alliance remained divided over the general desirability of using force, let alone with Russian opposition and without a UN mandate (Henriksen 2007: 136).

Concerning the internal factors of the coerced, internal support and security is classified negatively, although both the economic variable and the role of elites are considered positive. Conceding to the initial demand of halting the repressive campaign would probably only affect Milošević's immediate political support and regime security marginally. However, once the KLA was threatening to overrun the entire province, the stakes changed. Loosing Kosovo would have had major repercussions for Milošević, and would likely have lost him most of his political support. Thus regime security was better served by defiance and renewed aggression. On the other hand, although some sanctions had been lifted and foreign petroleum shipments were incoming, other sanctions remained in place (Jakobsen 2007: 242). The poor growth in Serbian economy in 1998 is evident in table 5.1. By complying with the demands, Milošević might hope to lift the remaining sanctions and provide better growth in the future. Finally, the VJ's opposition to Milošević's dirty work entails that in this sub-case, compliance

might have better served the interests of the military elites than defiance. This probably induced the initial agreement to withdraw, although they later saw it necessary to counter the KLA offensive.

Table 5.1: Serbian economy's performance in the late nineties (UN.org)⁴

Year	Annual Change in GDP (%)	GDP per Capita (USD)
1998	0.6	2,242
1999	-11.2	1,440

5.3.2 The October Agreements

While more and more refugees were flowing into Western European countries, the situation was worsened within Kosovo itself. Hence UNSCR 1199 was successfully passed on 23 September, calling for all available means to secure an immediate ceasefire in Kosovo, the withdrawal of FRY security elements, a rapid improvement of the humanitarian situation, the safe return of refugees, international monitoring of the situation, and further dialogue between the belligerents. The next day NATO followed up the demands by issuing an “activation warning” (ACTWARN); a non-binding, formal step in preparing the use of force. A range of alternatives was considered, from a limited air option to a sustained, phased air campaign (BBC 2003a). At the subsequent FRY Supreme Defense Council meeting, Milošević met his top aides and political partners. Reportedly, Serbian President Milan Milutinović urged him to accept the UNSCR demands, with VJ Chief of Staff Momčilo Perišić joining in; “[o]r the West would bomb us”. Snapping back, Milošević argued “[s]o what! The bombing will only last a few days then there will be peace. Once world opinion is mobilized, NATO will have to stop bombing...” (BBC 2003a). According to General Clark (2001: 128), it is possible that Russian diplomats had assured Milošević that there would be no further UN mandates for the use of force, and thus no major NATO intervention.

On 26 September Gornje Obrinje became the scene of a horrible event as 21 civilians were found massacred, apparently by the Serb Special Police as retaliation for recent guerilla activity in the area. Nearby, another 13 men were executed after hours of abuse at the hands

⁴ The two years' GDP cannot be compared directly, due to changes in the method of calculation.

of their Serb captors (Henriksen 2007: 151). Repulsed by these atrocities, NATO took a step further towards realizing the airstrikes threat, issuing an activation request (ACTREQ) on 1 October. Furthermore, the plan for the phased air campaign was approved, while Holbrooke was dispatched to meet with both Milošević and Kosovar Albanian representatives. On behalf of the Contact Group, he demanded that Milošević had to observe UNSCR 1199 immediately, or face a NATO air campaign (Clark 2001: 139). During these negotiations, Holbrooke requested the NAC to make further progress towards the air campaign, and an activation order (ACTORD) was issued on 13 October. While forward deployment of Alliance aircraft and warships commenced, the ACTORD gave Milošević 96 hours to comply or automatically trigger airstrikes (BBC 2003a). A few hours later, an accord was consequentially struck with the October Agreements, entailing Serbian compliance with UNSCR 1199 and the Contact Group demands, in addition to the creation of an Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), ground-based Kosovo Verification Mission (KVM) with 2,000 unarmed observers and a NATO air surveillance component (Burg 2003: 80). Even Russian foreign minister Igor Ivanov had indicated that Russia could support an OSCE-based solution (Clark 2001: 144). Milošević then issued a statement outlining the foundations for a potential political settlement, including autonomy, elections, and a local police force in Kosovo. Remembering the hostage-situations in Bosnia-Herzegovina, a NATO extraction force was deployed in neighboring Macedonia. As the KVM found adequate levels of Serb compliance, the impending airstrikes were suspended on 27 October (Henriksen 2007: 154-155).

In the October Agreements, NATO had threatened with the use of force in support of a concrete diplomatic initiative with limited, political goals. It allowed hundreds of thousands of internally displaced to return home, and gave Milošević measurable obligations to adhere to (Henriksen 2007: 155). However, to secure Serbian compliance, several significant “carrots” were granted; the deadline was extended twice, meanwhile more than 20,000 Serbian personnel were allowed to remain in Kosovo (Jakobsen 2007: 239). Furthermore, Serbian leadership made it clear they would only accept superficial changes to the way Kosovo was being governed (Burg 2003: 80). Therefore, some have argued that the October Agreements postponed, rather than proposed, a lasting political settlement. Perhaps its most serious weakness however, was that it did not formally include the KLA, despite earlier realizations that this would be necessary. Isolated from both formal obligations and NATO pressure, the KLA once again exploited the vacuum following a Serb withdrawal. It regrouped and rearmed, before continuing its attacks against Serb police forces and civilians,

rapidly gaining control over large areas previously held by the VJ (BBC 2003a). According to several sources, Milošević had believed that Holbrooke had promised to seal the border to Albania, thus stopping the KLA's supply of arms, as well as to freeze KLA assets and take other measures to reduce its influence. When this never happened, Milošević not only felt betrayed and cheated, but also realized that he would have to deal with the KLA himself, and this was something he estimated could be done within two weeks (Clark 2001: 150).

Another development also aggravated Milošević in this period. As early as September, U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright had suggested that Milošević be removed from office altogether. Soon after, the U.S. began issuing support to Milošević's political opponents. Robert Gelbard (cited in Henriksen 2007: 157) secretly contacted members of the Serbian opposition, even attempting to convince a high-level, Serb general to "*start a coup or something*". Not only did the general refuse, but in the aftermath of the October Agreements, these meetings were publicly disclosed in Serbian media. This probably cemented Milošević's fear that the U.S. were planning to replace him. Unsurprisingly, rather than welcoming the offer of an international force deployment to prevent further violence, in November and December Serbian authorities responded with Operation Horseshoe, aiming to cleanse Kosovo by force themselves. Repression and expulsion of the Kosovar Albanian population thus began anew (Burg 2003: 83).

Analysis

The outcome of this attempt is not easily assessed. On the one hand, Milošević and Serbian authorities agreed to the initial demands, but on the other, unintended consequences brought a renewal of the violence in the aftermath of the agreement. Nevertheless, given that coercive success, strictly speaking, is achieved when a threat is the dominant cause in changing the behavior of the coerced, it is clear that some degree of success was achieved. Therefore, the outcome of this sub-case is considered a qualified success.

The coercer's strategy was marked by positive values for all three variables; proportionality, reciprocity, and credibility. The demands of UNSCR 1199 entailed moderately limited type B demands, and although they required significant Serb withdrawals, they were clear and concise. As such, Milošević was assured that independence was no longer an option for Kosovo, limiting the potential costs of compliance. On the other hand, also given that KLA remained a significant force, NATO airstrikes could have had severe adverse effects on

Milošević's regime. Such attacks could have blocked the VJ's ability to neutralize the KLA, so that the latter might even have threatened Serb control over the province, and thus Milošević's very political survivability. Next, the degree of reciprocity is disputable. While both refraining from pressuring the KLA and allowing the Albanian border to remain open point to a lack of reciprocity, these factors arose only in the agreement's aftermath. Prior to and during the negotiations reciprocity should be considered positive, because the deadlines were postponed while more Serbian personnel were allowed to remain in Kosovo. Finally, also credibility was ambiguous for some time. As demonstrated in the FRY Supreme Defense Council, NATO's initial credibility was low, with Russian opposition, the lack of a clear UN mandate, and Alliance internal disagreement. However, the negative side-effects of the conflict galvanized NATO's political leaders to approve the ACTORD, thus cementing their resolve and credibility. When Russian acquiescence was secured with an OSCE-based ground mission, NATO's credibility was no longer in doubt.

Also all the internal factors can probably be considered positive. Milošević had played the nationalist card and begun Kosovo crackdown operations as a way to stay in power, and this remained a major consideration. Nevertheless, once the ACTORD was approved, the airstrikes guarantee would in likelihood have meant the immediate end of Milošević's regime. Compliance was therefore the only reasonable option, in terms of regime security and support. Next, following the renewal of the economic sanctions, it became ever more important for Serbian authorities to demonstrate flexibility. By complying, progress could be made towards reintegrating the FRY into the world economy. Finally, it seems both top Serbian political and military leaders like Milutinović and Perišić were eager to see Milošević concede. However, given that the KLA can be considered a key actor, it constitutes a serious challenge to the otherwise positive role of the key actors. That the KLA seized the opportunity to expand is hardly surprising; the escalation was a rational choice because their morale was improved by quick land-gains, the KVM was indirectly supplying and equipping them, and they still perceived U.S. support (BBC 2003a).

5.3.3 The Rambouillet Conference

Following the October Agreements, the series of provocations and retaliations continued between the KLA and Serb security forces, ultimately producing a devastating outburst of fighting in early 1999. On 15 January KVM observers reported Serb MUP and VJ forces assaulting the small village of Račak. In the aftermath, a total of 45 people were found killed.

Despite some controversy over the KVM's quick condemnation of the Serbs, for many the incident induced strong associations to Srebrenica. Determined to avoid another moral failure, the Račak massacre spawned an enormous momentum across the NATO countries (BBC 2003a). Secretary Albright and the U.S. State Department then refined this momentum into political action, and in producing a final negotiations strategy, linked the threat of airstrikes to a political settlement (Henriksen 2007: 164). The European response was that this time, also the KLA had to be included. Additionally, though Russia initially opposed the forceful U.S. policy, Moscow later agreed to cooperate should the negotiations be organized by the Contact Group (BBC 2003a). In a 30 January statement, the NAC gave the Contact Group their support, and set out the following demands:

...[T]he completion of the negotiations on an interim political settlement within the specified timeframe; full and immediate observance by both parties of the cease-fire and by the FRY authorities of their commitments to NATO, including by bringing VJ and Police/Special Police force levels, force posture and activities into strict compliance with the NATO/FRY agreement of 25 October 1998; and the ending of excessive and disproportionate use of force... (NATO.int 1999)

Furthermore, the statement warned that “[i]f these steps are not taken, NATO is ready to take whatever measures are necessary [...] the NATO Secretary General may authorise air strikes against targets on FRY territory”. However, SACEUR Clark (2001: 166) later pointed out that the potential targets lacked in potency, as too few high-value, top level command and control assets had been approved. Serb leadership was probably well aware of this. Nevertheless, the foundations had been laid for a last effort at peaceful negotiations.

The Rambouillet conference begun on 6 February, involving Contact Group representatives, a Kosovar Albanian delegation representing the Kosovar people, and a Serb delegation characterized by the lack of Milošević. While KLA leadership had been invited to the Kosovar delegation, the most hardline leaders had refused to attend. Thus only a small number of moderate KLA representatives eventually participated (The New York Times 1999c). From the start of the talks, it was conveyed to the Serbs that failure to sign would cause NATO airstrikes against the FRY, and to the Albanians that if they caused failure, they would be abandoned to subsequent Serb reprisals (Henriksen 2007: 168). Initially, the Serb delegation remained quiet and stalling, apparently believing that the Russians would save them from Western punishment. Milošević had probably calculated that the Albanians would

refuse any deal without independence, and that NATO therefore was unlikely to bomb. Instead aiming at collapsing the negotiations, he hoped for a return to the more favorable *status quo* (Henriksen 2007: 168-173).

While a draft treaty eventually was produced, it entailed more extensive demands than the 30 January NAC statement, and especially the treaty's military annex proved difficult. The text of the annex had simply been copied from the Dayton Accords, where it had related to Bosnia-Herzegovina only. In the Rambouillet version however, a large NATO peacekeeping force would be deployed to Kosovo, which also would enjoy unrestricted access to all of Serbia (Lambseth 2001: 8). On this basis, the Serb delegation argued that the military annex was nothing less than a thinly veiled military occupation, and refused to sign. As the Serb delegation stalled for time, VJ forces were building up in Kosovo, approximately doubling in numbers. Not only indicative of a new offensive, the reinforcements would likely also reduce the potential impact of future NATO airstrikes (Clark 2001: 167).

The Serbian refusal made the Albanian delegation worry that without a significant NATO ground presence, the security of their people could not be guaranteed, and thus also they refused to sign. To resolve the situation, Western diplomats met with the Albanians, reassuring them of NATO's protection, and offered other inducements, including training KLA officers in police activities in the U.S. (The New York Times 1999d). The representatives continued to resist however, because they had received threats from the KLA members who had boycotted the negotiations. "Remi" explains: "*[We] warned them: 'Don't you dare sign! [...] We will not use all our anti-aircraft rockets on the Serbs. If you sign, we will save one to bring down your plane'*" (BBC 2003a). The situation was finally resolved in a last-minute rescue by certain members of the Kosovar delegation, who feigned an Albanian agreement. This secured an almost three-week long suspension, so the delegates could return to Kosovo for consultation with the differing factions (The New York Times 1999d). Additionally, U.S. politician Robert Dole was sent to Kosovo, to reiterate that failure to sign would cause international abandonment (Henriksen 2007: 173).

When the conference reconvened, the Serbs presented a revised treaty text, provocatively favorable to Serbia. Nevertheless, and to the Serbs' great surprise, the Albanians signed the treaty on 18 March (Clark 2001: 175). Having expected an Albanian refusal, Milošević was forced to improvise, and consequentially refused to sign the treaty his own government had

drafted. During the next days the KVM was withdrawn, while NATO began final preparations for the phased air campaign.

Analysis

The outcome of the Rambouillet coercive diplomacy can be classified as a failure as no treaty was agreed upon. The coercive strategy was negative in proportionality and reciprocity, while positive in credibility. Although the demands of the draft treaty constituted type B coercive diplomacy, they were not limited. Firstly, it demanded not only wide scale Serb withdrawals, but even NATO access to large parts of Serbia, which was not required to police Kosovo (Henriksen 2007: 171). Hence, and especially following the October Agreements, Milošević probably speculated that NATO in truth aimed for type C coercive diplomacy; regime change. In contrast, while the coercive instruments would entail NATO airstrikes against Serb targets, these were expected to last only a few days. One U.S. Air Force Major noted that: “[e]verybody was talking three days” (BBC 2003c). Thus hardly three days’ worth of targets had been approved, mainly including enemy integrated air defense systems (IADS), and few or none top-level command and control assets (Henriksen 2007: 19). Next, reciprocity was largely lacking from the proposed settlement. Although the Albanian acceptance of the Serbs’ revised treaty provided some benefits, these were hardly reciprocal inducements. It was the Serbs themselves who had proposed them, in a treaty they never meant to accept. Credibility, on the other hand, became positive, even if the threats were lacking in potency. Not only had Russian acquiescence been obtained, but NATO had staked its own reputation on success, making its governments extremely likely to find ways of cooperating. Meanwhile, air assets had already been deployed to the theater, and the Račak incident had secured public support across Western countries.

As for the domestic conditions, internal political support and regime security, together with the role of elites, are classified as negative, as should probably also the economic calculus. Firstly, accepting the treaty’s military annex assumedly seemed like political suicide to Milošević. He feared it not only could lead to the forced detachment of Kosovo, but perhaps to his own elimination also (Henriksen 2007: 171; Lambseth 2001: 78). Furthermore, accepting what was perceived as a proposed NATO “occupation” of Serbia would have lost him virtually all political support. Secondly, the economic calculus is difficult to determine; compliance could still have brought Serbia closer to lifting the sanctions, but such a provision was not stated explicitly in the draft treaty. Instead it entailed hosting a large NATO force

with rights of bivouac, which probably would have induced its own set of costs. Furthermore, while the destruction of Serb IADS could have inflicted costs in terms of millions of U.S. dollars, Serb officials have later explained how they had become proficient at building effective decoys, worth less than 50 dollars each (BBC 2003c). These factors contributed to minimizing the costs of noncompliance, meanwhile the costs of compliance remained high, and the benefits of compliance uncertain. Finally, the limited data on the role of key actors suggests that also this condition was uncondusive. The hostile attitude of radical KLA members no doubt made Milošević assume the Albanians would not sign, and hence that NATO could not bomb. Furthermore, it is easy to imagine that VJ leadership would have been critical towards allowing NATO to use its infrastructure and facilities. Additionally, with their buildup in Kosovo, the VJ was less vulnerable to airstrikes than before, further reducing its incentive to comply.

5.3.4 Operation Allied Force

The first combat operations of NATO's Operation Allied Force (OAF) occurred on 24 March 1999, as U.S. B-52 bombers fired cruise missiles against hardened FRY structures (Lambeth 2001: 20). Two days earlier Holbrooke had visited Belgrade, delivering the Alliance's last ultimatum prior to bombing, which Milošević had refused outright. As noted earlier, most Western policy-makers assumed Milošević would concede after only few days of bombing. Nevertheless, formally approving air power had been difficult, as several European governments faced strong domestic opposition (Henriksen 2007: 11, 61). Thus NATO settled for a three-part, phased air campaign, based on the 1998 ACTWARN. Phase One would establish a NFZ over Kosovo, suppress FRY IADS, and target Serb forces fielded in Kosovo, with the aim to create a more permissive operating environment (Lambeth 2001: 19). General Clark (2001: 185) notes: "[w]e had to attack and disrupt – destroy if possible – the actual elements doing the ethnic cleansing". This objective soon became a priority, because Clark assessed that Milošević needed only five more days to permanently vanquish the KLA. Next, Phase Two would expand the bombing to additional FRY military targets south of latitude 44 degrees north, including lines of supply and communication. Finally Phase Three, as the most controversial, would entail a wide range of high-value, strategic, security, and military targets in all of the FRY, including downtown Belgrade. Authorization for shifting from one phase to the next, i.e. escalating the campaign, became a political, not military,

responsibility. Thus it is fair to say that this gradually escalating air campaign was dictated by political necessities rather than military principles of war (Henriksen 2007: 11, 13).

Intended to last only a few days, resting on fragile Alliance cohesion, and lacking a UN mandate, the campaign faced severe political restrictions. The main concern was minimizing both NATO casualties and collateral damage, while at all times maintaining cohesion (Clark 2001: 185-186). Initially, and even to some extent throughout the campaign, there were no clear, elaborated, or coherent grand strategy, objectives, or desired end-state, rendering the targeting process a restricted, sometimes random activity with day-by-day approval (Clark 2001: 203). Targets were often picked for their political acceptability rather than their estimated impact on Milošević's decision-making calculus. As so bluntly put by U.S. Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Joseph Ralston (cited in Henriksen 2007: 19): *"[b]ombing surface-to-air missile sites – why the hell would Milošević care about something like that? [...] [A]nd that was basically what was on the target list for the first three days"*.

The Serbs soon proved resilient, as not only Milošević remained largely unaffected, but also the suppression of FRY IADS was difficult. The combination of partly modernized, high-grade IADS and the general robustness of burrowed, Serb installations contributed to this (Clark 2001: 196). Furthermore, VJ morale remained adequate; a VJ commander stated that: *"[w]e had to neutralize the Albanian terrorist forces quickly to prevent a massive armed rebellion"* (BBC 2003c). Meanwhile, Russia had signaled strong disapproval of NATO's campaign, and even begun repositioning their own armed forces. NATO's poor results allowed the Serbs to escalate the ongoing ethnic cleansing, racing to complete them before negotiating with NATO became inevitable (BBC 2003c). After this first week with a "try-and-see" approach, NATO's first agreement in principle on war aims was secured. They demanded that the Serb security forces had to withdraw from Kosovo, to be replaced by a NATO-led, international peacekeeping force, and that refugees were allowed to return to their homes. Also the targeting process was facilitated, as General Ralston developed guidelines for what could *not* be bombed without prior political consultations. The guidelines prohibited targets in downtown Belgrade and in Montenegro, in addition to those where significant civilian casualties were probable. Furthermore, the electrical power grid could only be targeted for military purposes, e.g. interrupting the electrical supply to Serb IADS (Henriksen 2007: 21-22).

Without having fully achieved its Phase One objectives, OAF formally moved into Phase Two on 28 March, and into an intermediary step often called Phase Two Plus already on 30 March. The reasons for this rapid development were several. Firstly, because of the severe target restrictions, Phase Two introduced no significant new targets except eight bridges. Also, there were increasing concerns for the expenditure rates of a drawn-out campaign. Finally, it was recognized that the air threat's potency needed strengthening to correspond with the inflating war aims, as a return to the Rambouillet terms was considered unacceptable following the escalation of the ethnic cleansing (Clark 2001: 218-219). In sum, realizing that Phase Three was never likely to get authorized, NATO military communities suggested Phase Two Plus, wherein the Secretary-General could authorize Phase Three targets in Phase Two, on a case-by-case basis. It allowed targeting more infrastructure elements, including bridges and other lines of transportation.

At the turn of the month, Kosovo's situation remained poor. While more targets were being approved than before, truly decisive targets were still too controversial. Such targets could include top-level headquarters, presidential residences, communications and TV stations, and the electric infrastructure (Clark 2001: 238). Some evidence even suggests the initial effect of the bombing was to rally the Serbian population around its government (Lambeth 2001: 82). Disagreements yet again surfaced within the Alliance, especially between the more aggressive and strategic-minded Americans and the restrictive and tactical-minded Europeans. As perhaps the most telling sign of disunity, several NATO countries legally continued petroleum shipments to the FRY, all the while their own aircraft were trying to disrupt this same segment of Serbian economy (Clark 2001: 268-269).

Seizing the moment, the Serbs commenced yet another offensive, forcing Kosovar Albanians from their homes with mass expulsions. The number of internally displaced and refugees soon reached some 540,000. Before long, major KLA resistance had been neutralized, allowing the Serb security forces to terminate their operations and disperse from NATO airstrikes. The benefit of the renewed offensive was nevertheless a galvanizing of the Alliance's determination. Having temporarily achieved his goals in Kosovo, Milošević declared a unilateral cease-fire on 6 April. However, the severe atrocities that had been committed had caused such fury within the Western public that the declaration was largely ignored (Clark 2001: 236, 253-254). Instead, NATO escalated by introducing USS *Theodore Roosevelt* to the theater, and by striking Pristina's main telecommunications building (Lambeth 2001: 31).

Shortly after OAF had reached one month, a NATO attack against one of Milošević's residences marked a shift in the Alliance's approach. Not only did a potential NATO ground deployment become increasingly considered, but at the 23-25 April summit in Washington, NATO political leaders demonstrated greater resolve than before. They agreed to target more high-value strategic assets, and further authorized SACEUR to inspect and divert petroleum shipments bound for the FRY. Additionally, the campaign's objectives were finally formalized; cementing the *de facto* objectives and determining a path forwards (Clark 2001: 260-273). According to air power analyst Benjamin Lambeth (2001: 38-39), the new aims included directly pressuring Belgrade's political and military elite, challenging Milošević's domestic powerbase, and demonstrating that the Serbian government would no longer find any obligingness. Russian President Boris Yeltsin offered a final improvement when he called President Clinton, offering to dispatch Viktor Chernomyrdin to Belgrade (BBC 2003c).

Following the summit, more petroleum facilities, factories, lines of transportation, and high-level military sites were targeted, including the Belgrade offices of the Serbian state radio and TV channels. The headquarters of both the MUP and certain paramilitary forces were attacked, as was the electrical infrastructure, temporarily shutting down large parts of Serbia's electrical supply. Meanwhile, General Clark (2001: 291-292) reiterated the need for granting the KLA a post-conflict role, suggesting it could be transformed into a civilianized police force. The new strategy soon proved its virtue; on 6 May Milošević initiated a "peace offensive", stepping down the military efforts in Kosovo. Furthermore, ongoing Group of Eight (G-8) negotiations drafted a peace-proposal which was submitted to the UN, demanding full withdrawal of Serb forces from Kosovo, replacing them with an international peacekeeping force. Finally, according to U.S. Secretary of Defense William Cohen (Lambeth 2001: 70), when airstrikes against Belgrade became regular, senior VJ officials began sending their families out of the FRY. The same officers would later openly oppose Milošević, pressuring him to concede to the international demands (The New York Times 1999a).

Despite the promising development however, a series of events in mid-May broke the campaign's momentum. On 8 May, the Belgrade Chinese embassy was attacked by NATO aircraft, meanwhile other severe incidents of misfire and collateral damage soon followed. Airstrikes against the capital desisted for a time, allowing the Serbs time to adapt to the changing situation. In Kosovo, for example, there were reports of civilians being held as human shields, held under bridges and at other strategic targets. Furthermore, most of the

obvious and easy targets had been struck, and expanding the target list would entail greater risks to both NATO assets and the FRY civilian population (Clark 2001: 298-300, 307).

As the immediate pressure subsided a new set of targets was identified and approved, allowing for further escalation while minimizing risk. Firstly, the electrical infrastructure was struck again, damaging not only Serbian IADS, but also the civilian banking system and other important, electrical infrastructures. Simultaneously, as the number of factories being bombed increased, unemployment began to rise, and national productivity was undercut. Later, even the civilian telephone and computer networks became approved targets (Lambseth 2001: 41-43). These targets were largely owned and operated by Serbia's oligarchical businessmen, who so far had been served well by Milošević's regime, but now were brought to the brink of bankruptcy (Lambseth 2001: 71). Consequently, renowned Serbian economist Mladen Dinkić (cited in Lambseth 2001: 42) noted, while the population would not starve, the country's *"...industrial base [was] destroyed and the size of the economy cut in half"*. It wasn't long before the initial defiance was traded for popular weariness and anger with the Serbian government (Clark 2001: 277, 295-297, 317; Lambseth 2001: 42).

As the campaign progressed, planning for a ground option continued despite the lack of consensual support. On the one hand, General Clark (2001: 284) argued that just this planning and preparations generated leverage over Milošević, even while a deployment remained months away. On the other hand, the VJ were still heavily entrenched in Kosovo, and a ground invasion could have encountered between 50,000 and 100,000 VJ troops and heavy weapons (Clark 2001: 286). The strength of this force could not be underestimated, as became clear on 26 May, when 4,000 regrouped KLA guerillas launched Operation Arrow against the VJ forces. NATO refused in principle extensive cooperation with these KLA forces, and thus it took the VJ no more than three days to defeat the KLA offensive. According to Lambseth (2001: 53-54), while there was some cooperation between the KLA and NATO, they mostly fought separate, but parallel wars against the Serbs. The benefit of this parallel effort however, was that KLA operations would sometimes force VJ and MUP forces out from hiding, thus exposing them to NATO airstrikes.

OAF was finally brought closer to its conclusion when, on 2 June, special envoy Chernomyrdin and Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari visited Belgrade to convince Milošević to concede. They presented an ultimatum engineered by the U.S., the European Union, and Russia, entailing full Serbian acquiescence to NATO's demands. This included Serb

withdrawal, the autonomy of Kosovo as an integral part of the FRY, and limited bombing until implementation was secured. Milošević agreed to the terms, and the Serbian national assembly ratified his decision already the next day. Nevertheless, Serbian heel-dragging delayed the peace-process for a few days, meanwhile VJ forces were ordered to a final offensive against the KLA. In response, NATO airstrikes resumed at full strength, further chastening the VJ, who now perceived Milošević to have put them in a position of jeopardy (BBC 2003c). Thus on 9 June, facing immense national and international pressure, the Serbian government began withdrawing the VJ from Kosovo (Lambseth 2001: 59-60). Based on the G-8 proposal, a final settlement was hammered out. To secure agreement however, the Serbs required a four days extension of the withdrawal deadline, as well as a guarantee of Russian participation in the peacekeeping force (KFOR). Additionally, references to NATO command and control of KFOR had to be moderated, while the peacekeeping forces also had to commit to police the Albanian border, sealing off the KLA's main source of support (Clark 2001: 366-370). On 10 June SACEUR suspended OAF, and a few hours later UNSCR 1244 authorized KFOR's entry into Kosovo, bringing yet another Balkan conflict to its end.

Analysis

In this final sub-case the outcome ultimately became a success, as Milošević and the VJ accepted the NATO and G-8 demands. Nevertheless, OAF required 78 days of escalating bombing to produce this result. Given the operation's changing character over its duration, it could be warranted to analytically divide it in two. Although its latter part in no way was independent from its first part, the approaches made were so different that a division probably is fruitful. Thus the first part of OAF lasts from its launch on 24 March and until, but not including, the 21 April strike on Milošević's residence. It is disputable whether this part should be considered as coercive diplomacy or military coercion, but for the sake of completeness I have chosen to include it. The second part begins on 21 April and lasts until the operation's suspension on 10 June.

The coercer's strategy in the first part can be considered as negative proportionality and reciprocity, while credibility was marginally positive. The second part, on the other hand, entails a positive classification for all variables. Proportionality was initially negative, as the demands were not only unclear, but also entailed moderately limited type B objectives that soon inflated further. Neither were the instruments used proportionally potent, as striking IADS would hardly harm Milošević's center of gravity (Henriksen 2007: 19). Although the

IADS would have had to be targeted regardless, in order to secure the operating environment, the fact that these initially were the *only* approved targets reduced potency. Additionally, when disrupting the elements carrying out ethnic cleansing proved difficult, significant friction was generated in the operation's chain of command, undermining its efficiency (Henriksen 2007: 12). Even after the target list was expanded in Phase Two Plus, high-value targets remained absent. Finally, without an imminent ground threat, Milošević was assured Kosovo could not be forcibly detached from Serbia (Clark 2001: 262). In the second part however, the Washington summit formalized and clarified the objectives, while strikes against leadership residences and headquarters brought consequences to the leaders themselves. Also the increased infrastructure attacks caused the costs of noncompliance to rise. These strategic targets often proved less troublesome than the tactical ones, in terms of weather, available aircraft, and Serb IADS capacity (Clark 2001: 247). Finally, while a credible ground threat was still distant, it would have hit so heavily at Milošević's centers of gravity that the fall of his regime would have been likely (Lambseth 2001: 46). On the other hand, Chernomyrdin later stated that Milošević had actually hoped for a NATO ground offensive, which would have enabled the use of partisan tactics to inflict greater numbers of casualties (de Wijk 2005: 199-200).

Reciprocity was initially negative, before it became positive in the latter part. In the first period, no proper "carrots" were offered to Milošević's regime, thus depriving it of a face-saving way to concede. In the second part however, several concessions were made to the Serbs. Firstly, the choice of negotiators, a Russian and a non-NATO representative, meant the Serbs would not have to negotiate with NATO directly. Furthermore, the deadline for withdrawal was extended, Russian participation in KFOR was secured, NATO command and control was moderated, and the Albanian border was sealed off.

Finally, credibility is considered positive for both parts, but more clearly so in the latter period. Uneasy alliance cohesion, the lack of a UN mandate, Russian opposition, high costs of a prolonged air campaign, and Western public opposition all contributed to undermining it initially. However, while the way the campaign was executed often has drawn criticism, it was also its restrictive nature that ultimately lent it some degree of credibility (Lambseth 2001: 78-81). Additionally, it would have had severe repercussions for NATO, should it have failed in Kosovo, giving it a further improvement of credibility. In the latter period, Russian opposition was moderated, a UNSCR draft was in the making, and Western opinion was galvanized by the continued atrocities. All these factors contributed to a solid credibility in

OAF's final stage, making it seem to Milošević that NATO could continue with virtually indefinite and unhindered punishment (Lambseth 2001: 69).

The initial domestic factors can be classified as negative for internal support and security, a marginally positive economic calculus, and probably a negative role of key actors. In its latter part however, all factor turned positive. In the first period, internal support and security was dominated by the spontaneous defiance of the Serbian population. This contributed to strengthening Milošević's regime, while continued repression in Kosovo gained him influence with the Serbian radicals. This changed in the latter part, when NATO showed willingness and ability to destroy assets central to Milošević's control over Serbian society. As winter was approaching, living with continuous bombing even damaging the country's utilities was becoming very difficult. Due to public weariness, Milošević's political survival became dependent on securing peace with NATO (Lambseth 2001: 80-85).

It is difficult to determine the Serbian economic calculus for OAF's first part. On the one hand, the costs inflicted by NATO were extremely limited; the initial bombing produced poor results, infrastructure targets were not systematically struck, the FRY continued trade in petroleum, and even the successful use of targeting decoys all contributed to mitigating the costs. On the other hand, the costs of continuing VJ operations also have to be considered, in addition to the limited damage caused by NATO. It is likely that the economic outcome was almost balanced between defiance and compliance, but since at least some extra costs were incurred, a positive value can perhaps be assigned. This changed radically in OAF's latter part however. Better bombing results, more infrastructure and manufacturing targets, and the disruption in trade and petroleum flows caused large-scale devastation to the Serbian economy.

Finally, there is relatively little information available on the role of key actors and elites in the first part of OAF. Certainly, while the morale of the VJ remained sufficient, the KLA were also taking a very hostile attitude, making the Serbs less likely to concede. This gives some reason to classify this value as slightly negative. The situation became clearer in the final stages however, when central VJ elements openly opposed Milošević, fatigued by their Kosovo campaign. Furthermore, after Operation Arrow the KLA realized that NATO would not undoubtedly come to their rescue, and were further induced towards a settlement by being offered a post-conflict role. Thirdly, the attacks on state media and Serbian manufacturing brought the war directly to the business and security interests of Milošević, his family, and his

associates. Thus, according to Lambseth (2001: 70), it is likely that elite pressure was mounting behind the façade in Belgrade. The Serbian loss of Russian support, Lambseth (2001: 69) says, was a contributing, but not crucial factor.

6 Conclusion

The aim of this chapter is to summarize, and compare and discuss the findings of the foregoing chapters. Furthermore, some considerations are made on causality, key variables, and mismatching objectives and strategies, before the research question is answered. Ultimately, some final remarks on the thesis' strengths and limitations are made.

6.1 Results

This section will sum up the main findings of the preceding case studies. As explained in chapter three, for each sub-case I will consider the values assigned to each variable, so that the theoretical framework can generate predictions of the outcomes. This can then be compared with the actual, historical outcome, to see whether or not the prediction was correct. Ultimately, I will summarize how well the theory's predictions were congruent with the actual outcomes across all sub-cases.

The first task will be summarizing the findings of chapters four and five. While the chapters hold more detail than can be summed up here, a simplification is warranted as long as it aids in answering the research question (Everett and Furseth 2004: 143). Furthermore, a more detailed discussion on key factors can be found later in this chapter. The main findings of the case studies have therefore been presented in table 6.1, below. It lists each sub-case⁵, both variable groups with three variables each, and the values these were assigned. Next, as operationalized in section 3.3.1, the theoretically expected outcome is given. Finally, the actual outcome is also noted.

At first impressions, the level of congruence is satisfactory; in the most conservative estimation, of a total of 12 sub-cases, the theory correctly predicted nine outcomes. In other words, the theory can account for at least 75% of the variance in the dependent variable. Of the three remaining cases, only one was predicted outright wrong; Assault at Goražde. In the other two incidents, the Siege of Sarajevo and the October Agreements, some form of qualification modified the actual outcome, rendering the lack of congruence a matter of gradation. As the current operationalization includes absolutes, not gradations, the fact that

⁵ Bosnian sub-cases are above the horizontal line, Kosovar below.

Table 6.1: Main findings of chapters four and five, with expected and actual outcomes

Sub-case	Proportionality	Reciprocity	Credibility	Internal Political Support and Regime Security	Economic Costs and Benefits	Role of Elites and Key Actors	Expected Outcome	Actual Outcome
The Naval Blockade	Negative	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Failure	Failure
Operation Deny Flight	Positive	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Failure	Failure
The Siege of Sarajevo	Positive	Positive	Negative	Positive	Positive	Positive	Failure	Qualified Success
The Markale Massacre	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Success	Success
Assault at Goražde	Positive	Negative	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Failure	Success
The Tuzla Shelling	Negative	Positive	Negative (?)	Negative	Negative	Negative	Failure	Failure
Operation Deliberate Force	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Success	Success
Operation Determined Falcon	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Positive	Positive	Failure	Failure
The October Agreements	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive (?)	Success	Qualified Success
The Rambouillet Conference	Negative	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Failure	Failure
Operation Allied Force, Part 1	Negative	Negative	Positive (?)	Negative	Positive (?)	Negative	Failure	Failure
Operation Allied Force, Part 2	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Success	Success

these qualifications were not accounted for probably stems from methodological choices, and not the theory itself. Thus a more optimistic interpretation of the results might count only one outright failure, entailing that the theory holds upwards of 90% explanatory power. It is most likely however, that the true number of explainable variance in the dependent variable lies somewhere between 75% and 90%.

It is also positive that the theory predicted fewer successes than actually occurred, as it is preferable for the theory to be too conservative rather than too liberal. Interestingly, by including the qualified successes, NATO succeeded in using the strategy of coercive diplomacy as a crisis management tool in six out of twelve sub-cases, indicating a 50% success rate. This is a higher rate than found in other, more general studies of the successfulness of coercive diplomacy (c.f. Jakobsen 2007). Within the limitations of this study, it is difficult to say exactly why NATO should be more successful than other constellations of states or organizations. One factor can perhaps be that due to the Alliance's inter-governmental nature, only crises where the members perceive high enough levels of cohesion and possibilities of resolution are dealt with through the NATO platform. In other words, perhaps NATO has better possibilities for "picking its battles" than other organizations or individual states.⁶ Furthermore, NATO could also have a more developed strategic culture than other actors, and perhaps even more credibility, once it commits to a cause.

Relative Difficulty of the Conditions

Looking at how often each condition was positive or not gives an indication of how difficult it was for NATO to meet that requirement, relative to the other conditions. While a fairly even spread is observable, some conditions were satisfied more often than others. The condition that was most often present was the economic costs and benefits. That it was positive for almost all the sub-cases is evidential of the West's partiality for using economic sanctions as coercive tools. Not only are these widely used, but they are probably also the form of coercion that the West knows best. The two that were met the fewest times were reciprocity and internal political support. This can indicate the political difficulties associated with aiding or reciprocating a regime that, in the process of generating legitimacy and public support, has been demonized in Western media and politics. Professor Flynt Leverett (2004) has noted it has often been typical neoconservative policy to deny rogue states "carrots" for concessions,

⁶ Unlike the UN for example, which will always have some obligation to intervene in international conflict.

even when such inducements almost certainly would bring about a change of behavior. Certain contemporary trends are furthermore bringing such policies into mainstream politics, as a public demand for distribution of responsibility has made international indictment of misbehaving state leaders a common practice. Ironically, this development has reduced NATO's potential for influencing international politics by dealing with such leaders. It is thus becoming ever harder to supply the "carrot" in "carrot and stick" approaches.

Finally, by comparing values across the two general cases, some further observations can be made. Firstly, proportionality was significantly more often present in Bosnia than in Kosovo. This can be supportive of the thesis' claim that the great importance of Kosovo to the Serbs was generally misunderstood in NATO countries. Secondly, credibility was more often secured in Kosovo than in Bosnia, reflecting NATO's relatively strong determination in the Kosovo case. It is likely also a testimony of how coordination with the UN and its "dual key" system frustrated NATO's coercive efforts.

6.1.1 The Diverging Sub-Cases

Because only three sub-cases diverged from the rest by incorrect predictions, a short inspection of these can be interesting. This could identify omitted variables, measurement errors, or other theoretical or methodological issues.

The Siege of Sarajevo

As the VRS closed Sarajevo's supply lines in late summer 1993, the consensus in NATO countries was that a humanitarian crisis was imminent. However, Sarajevo was not in more imminent danger than it had been for 18 months (Owen 1995: 205). To some extent, NATO therefore misinterpreted the intentions behind the VRS offensive, and was unable to devise a relevant threat with clear and suitable objectives. Conversely, the Bosnian Serb offensive and its withdrawal were both primarily dictated by internal political and military necessities. It was intended to hedge against ARBiH counter-offensives, and this was something NATO should have considered from the outset. Instead, the UN safeguard became the *sine qua non* of the VRS withdrawal, and perhaps, as Jakobsen (1998: 92) has suggested, appeasement is a more accurate term for what happened. This can either mean that the sub-case was never a proper incident of coercive diplomacy, and should not have been analyzed as one, or that the

measurement of the outcome as a qualified success was incorrect, because coercive diplomacy failed while appeasement succeeded.

Assault at Gorazde

In perhaps the most baffling of all the incidents, the NATO governments, internally disunited and vulnerable to counter-coercion, overcame the difficulties to produce a successful outcome. In terms of the theoretical framework, only reciprocity was considered negative. This could suggest that in a strict sense, reciprocity is not a necessary condition; a conclusion with some support in other studies (c.f. Jakobsen 1998: 134). An alternative explanation is that again the withdrawal was predicated on domestic interests, not external pressure. Pale had no intent of overrunning the enclave, but to counter repeated ARBiH offensives. Finally, the deteriorating relationship with Serbia can perhaps temporarily have induced the Bosnian Serbs towards a more cooperative stance.

The October Agreements

The last divergent sub-case turned out less successful than theoretically expected. What initially resembled a flawless execution of coercive diplomacy was moderated when NATO's lack of leverage over the KLA allowed the latter to exploit the Serb concessions. It is nearly for this reason alone that the October Agreements were not a full success. The theoretical framework, however, reflects this observation in the unclear coding of the role of key actors. The coding was unclear because while key Serbian elites were positive towards compliance, the KLA, another key actor, was quite negative. It is likely this diversion in the set of key actors that explains the moderation of an otherwise successful attempt at coercive diplomacy.

6.2 Causality

The degree of congruence between the expected and actual outcomes has been shown to be between 75% and 90%. In itself, this is strongly supportive of the theoretical framework. Nevertheless, a mere covariation between certain values on the independent variables and the variance in the dependent variable is not sufficient to determine that there exists a causal mechanism or relationship. The observed pattern could, for instance, also be the product of randomness, spuriousity, or inverted causality.

Questions of spuriousity and causal priority ask whether there could be other, underlying variables that affect both the independent and dependent variables (George and Bennett 2005: 185). Such factors could include the degree of willingness with which the NATO governments involved themselves, the urgency of the incident at hand, or the presence of international leadership within the group of coercers. Unlike more quantitative methods, case study approaches have few means of formally controlling for such errors. Nevertheless, some measures have been taken to reduce the chance of spuriousity. First of all, through intimate knowledge of both the subject-matter and other, relevant works of literature, case study approaches are generally unlikely to overlook variables of major significance. Next, the elements of process-tracing that have been incorporated have helped illustrate, if not prove, not only *that* positive values on the independent variables contributed to successful outcomes, but also *how* they did so. Finally, although introducing certain new, innovative elements, this study has been designed and executed in the context of more established works of research. That some of its methods, variables, and findings are analogous to other studies helps determine that there in fact exists a causal relationship between the specified variables (George and Bennett 2005: 185-187). On this note, it should be considered that it is the more innovative elements of the approach that most require further study and testing.

Another topic to be addressed is the possibility of inverted causality. Could the observed consistency indicate that the outcome of the dependent variable somehow brought about the conditions specified by the independent variables? Could, for instance, key actors and elites have observed the decision-maker's decision to comply with the external demands, and then decided to support the decision, in order to preserve their political and social positions? It is hard to deny this possibility, and this remains a serious challenge to a claim of causality. However, again the elements of process-tracing, as well as the chronology of the historical narratives presented, help insure a correct conceptualization of cause and effect.

In light of the considerations made in this section, I will not claim that there absolutely exists a causal mechanism between the specified variables. There are always caveats, and some of them are hard to control for within the current research design. Nevertheless, given close study of the subject-matter, elements of process-tracing, and some support in earlier research, it is warranted to claim that it is *likely* that the variables are part of a causal mechanism as specified in this thesis. If we assume that the specified relationship is of a causal nature, then the next question might be how much weight should be attached to the various variables. This

is also difficult to answer definitively within the limits of the current research design. Some reflections are nevertheless made in the following section.

6.3 Key Variables

This section considers the role and importance of the various variables and variable groups. I discuss this topic in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions, as well as in more general terms for the variable groups as a whole.

6.3.1 Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

Traditionally, case studies have often been concerned with identifying necessary and sufficient conditions for given outcomes. While using exclusively this approach for evaluation of results has come under some critique, a short evaluation of what this study has found can be constructive. As noted earlier, a conservative starting point is preferable, entailing that all variables are assumed necessary for a successful outcome, and none are sufficient. This hypothesis makes testing and falsification more straight forward.

In this thesis no single variable could explain the variance in the dependent variable, meaning that the hypothesis was correct in assuming no sufficient conditions. Instead, the first challenge to the hypothesis is the Siege of Sarajevo, where a qualified success was achieved without sufficient credibility. Does this imply that credibility is not a necessary condition? I would argue that it does not. Not only should the framework probably be understood in more probabilistic than deterministic terms, but other studies have also demonstrated the critical role of credibility axiomatically, logically, theoretically, and empirically, and it is one of the most robust findings in coercive diplomacy literature. Furthermore, the observation stems from a sub-case with potential measurement errors; meanwhile all other sub-cases with an outcome other than failure included positive credibility. Therefore I do not find this single observation as grounds for dismissing the necessity of credibility in coercive diplomacy.

Next, Assault at Goražde proved successful without a reciprocal element. Although this runs counter to the expectations of the conservative formulation of the theoretical framework, it is not without support in other studies. Neither Schelling (1976), Jakobsen (1998: 134), nor George and Simons (1994) found this variable to be more than a facilitating factor, in a strict sense. The observation made here, although in just a single sub-case, can support the idea that

reciprocity is not a necessary condition. Given the many successful cases in which it was included however, it is not advisable for policy-makers to neglect this factor altogether.

Summing up, it is worth noting that the variables are likely connected by more of a probabilistic than a deterministic relationship, and hence that a single, diverging sub-case is insufficient to disqualify a trend visible in many other cases (George and Bennett 2005: 116). Additionally, considering necessity and sufficiency in strict terms assumes that the independent variables are completely independent of each other, but this is unlikely. The past two chapters demonstrated several times how the different independent variables could affect each other. Additionally, there are two pairs of variables wherein their values covariate in all sub-cases but one; proportionality versus internal political support, and internal political support versus the role of elites. The first pair can indicate the close connection between the proportionality of a threat and the threatened regime's survivability, thereby supporting the assumption made about the differences of extensiveness between types A, B, and C coercive diplomacy. The second pair underlines the importance of elites for the ruling regime's survivability, lending credence to the idea presented in section 2.3.3; that no ruling regime can isolate itself from at least a small group of elites. This approach to variable interdependence is related to what George and Bennett (2005: 26) has called conjunctural causation, i.e. that certain conjunctions of variables can produce a given outcome, that the sum is greater than all the parts, in a sense.

6.3.2 External Pressure versus Domestic Politics

Given that not all variables can be considered completely independent of each other, it may be fruitful to discuss the key factors in more broad, conjunctural terms, like the two variable groups. As shown in table 6.1, for most sub-cases with an outcome other than failure, all variables were considered positive. In general, this is a strong argument in favor of the theoretical framework. Furthermore, for non-failures where all variables were not positive, at most one variable was marked negatively, and this variable was always in the coercer's strategy group. In other words, for all non-failures, the domestic variables were always classified positively, while no sub-case where all domestic variables were considered positive ended in failure. This can indicate a certain primacy of the domestic factors over the external coercer's strategy. If so, it would imply that the most important factors for determining the outcome of coercive diplomacy lies outside the coercer's control; a somewhat controversial implication, as Western decision-makers use limited military means precisely to influence

international security developments. In the following section, this possibility is considered in more detail.

In determining the relative importance of the two groups, comparing the Siege of Sarajevo and the October Agreements with the Markale Massacre is especially interesting, not least because the former two were the only incidents where a modification qualified an otherwise successful outcome. In the first of these sub-cases, success was achieved only once the UN promised the Serbs significant concessions, most notably a safeguard deployment of peacekeepers. This strategy was later criticized for being too appeasing (c.f. Jakobsen 1998: 92). While appeasement likely was required to make up for a lack of credibility, it can also be considered the *sine qua non* of Serb compliance. When a similar safeguard was neglected following the October Agreements the KLA exploited the vacuum, frustrating an otherwise text-book example of coercive diplomacy. In this incident, U.S. representatives had virtually no leverage over the Kosovar organization, and according to Steven Burg (2003: 78, 104), it was mainly this lack of leverage that hollowed out the success. Finally, these partly contrasting sub-cases should be considered in light of the third incident, the Markale Massacre. The successful outcome of the latter case is usually not problematized, and although it was secured by last-minute Russian involvement, it too involved deploying peacekeepers as safeguards. Rather than being criticized, this deployment was considered appropriate to ensure compliance without bloodshed. Comparing these three incidents highlights the central role of such safeguards, and how the domestic purposes they served were crucial in determining the outcomes. These dilemmas are probably worth further investigation in later studies.

Next, it is perhaps the concurrence of Operation Deliberate Force with the federation ground offensive that most immediately suggests itself as the crucial factor for final conflict termination in Bosnia. Indeed, this has often been the opinion of central decision-makers in the NATO countries (Henriksen 2007: 117). After the launch of the ground offensive it became clear to Bosnian Serb decision-makers that the longer the conflict dragged out, the worse the balance of force was going to get. Besides making significant land gains, one major effect of the offensive was to block and interrupt VRS maneuverability, forcing it to choose between dispersing from the NATO airstrikes or enduring them as it tried to halt the federation advance. Thus the NATO coercive attempt was dramatically strengthened by developments on the ground, without which the air campaign would have been far less effective (Henriksen 2007: 113-115). This distinguishes the Bosnian conflict termination from

that in Kosovo, where there was no counterpart to the ground campaign (Clark 2001: 119). As long as Milošević was assured that ground forces were not being considered seriously, he was sure he could not lose Kosovo forcibly, and that he could hold onto it until he agreed to give it up (Jakobsen 2007: 239). The lack of a ground campaign also helps explain why the two bombing campaigns experienced so different effectiveness against fielded forces.

It can, however, be argued that conflict resolution was not primarily brought about so quickly after Deliberate Force due to the operation itself. Following the escalating power struggles between Milošević and Karadžić, the former had had plans for replacing the latter since spring 1994. Thus, even though he had earlier supported the region's secession, Milošević did nothing as Krajina was overrun during Operation Storm. Furthermore, Milošević had accepted negotiations over preliminary peace plans as early as in summer 1995, before neither Deliberate Force nor the federation offensive had begun (Henriksen 2007: 111). Caught in a pincer movement between the international community and Milošević, the Bosnian Serbs came under extreme pressure soon forcing them to yield.

The latter explanation assigns significant weight to the role of Milošević. What, therefore, secured his cooperation in Bosnia, and prevented it in Kosovo? First of all, it has been argued that the 1992 economic sanctions actually helped Milošević stay in power, because while widespread nationalism enabled the population to endure the costs in the name of national interest, the regime's legitimacy was strengthened domestically by the external pressure (de Wijk 2005: 96-97). Nevertheless, Holbrooke (1998: 4) has claimed that for ending the Bosnian conflict, the greatest piece of leverage over Milošević had been tightening and/or loosening these same sanctions. How could the same set of sanctions have so different consequences against the same regime? To disperse some of the massive, domestic pressure following the disintegration of the SFRY, Serb authorities promoted latent nationalist sentiments, using ethnic hatred to organize and sustain political support. Such "politics of identity" are often manipulated by threatened regimes as a way of managing their own survival (Jackson 2007: 154). Initially, this strong ethno-nationalism formed the core of the Serbs' strategic center of gravity, leaving little room for negotiation or compromise. As the conflict progressed however, with continued poor economic development, general war exhaustion, and increasing refugee flows from the conflict areas into Serbia itself, the drawbacks of nationalism were becoming clear (Henriksen 2007: 112). This exhausted the nationalist sentiment and weakened Milošević's regime, so that the impact of the external pressure multiplied. The sanctions thus became central in coercing the Serbs into accepting

peace. This interpretation supports the claim made in section 2.3.3; that the stronger political support the target regime enjoys, the less effect can be expected from external pressure, and vice versa.

In general, these conditions were different in Kosovo. First of all, the Rambouillet negotiations differed from Dayton in that they took place without any major war exhaustion, whereas the parties at Dayton had been through years of tough fighting and three failed peace plans (Henriksen 2007: 168, 173). Next, the dramatic recession of the Serbian economy during the Bosnian war was not mirrored in the Kosovo conflict, at least not until the latter part of OAF. Finally, the Serbs' perception of Kosovo's relative importance was widely overlooked. Often, the Kosovo war both was, and to some extent still is, considered a continuation of the Bosnian conflict. Thus, the coercive strategy for Kosovo was modeled after the successful end-game strategy of the Bosnian crisis. Initially, the coercive instruments were kept roughly equal in scale, although the extensiveness of what was demanded grew exponentially. While the Republika Srpska was of less strategic and political importance to Milošević, Kosovo was so crucial that losing it would have significantly undermined his power base (Henriksen 2007: 116). Therefore, the extensive objectives could not be matched with proportional coercive measures until NATO, having issued a total of 25 warnings to the Serbs, had invested so much in resolving the crisis that its own stakes grew beyond mere normative interests (de Wijk 2005: 34).

Summing up, while it is important not to underestimate the impact of the coercer's strategy, some evidence points to the target's domestic political and economic situation as the most critical in shaping both war effort and termination. The domestic factors often proved governing for any given sub-case, while the coercer's strategy had to be adapted to the situation to be effective. Illustratively, Lambeth (2001: 78) has noted that in the Kosovo conflict, Milošević's surrender was the product of a number of factors that ultimately took time to develop and come into effect. As for Bosnia, it should be noted that the coercive strategy's sometimes poor results also could be because coercion was not explicitly formulated as an integrated part of the diplomatic effort. When UN General Sir Rupert Smith approved Deliberate Force there existed no larger, political or strategic master-plan. Similarly, Holbrooke later stated that at the time, bombing was seen as a separate measure from the diplomatic negotiations (Henriksen 2007: 118). Instead, it is likely that the most important contribution of Deliberate Force was to prove the extent of NATO's determination and resolve.

6.4 Mismatching Objectives and Strategies

As explained in chapter two, one can generally distinguish between the two strategies of coercive diplomacy and military coercion. While closely related, they nevertheless require different approaches, something de Wijk (2005: 84) argues most theories do not sufficiently account for. While it has not been the main analytical focus of this thesis, a short reflection on the consequences of this lack of distinction is constructive towards answering the research question.

Coercive diplomacy is meant to influence a voluntary actor's decision-making calculus at its margins. By modifying and changing the payoffs of the target's options, the aim is to induce the adversary into making certain choices. For this purpose, the threat or limited use of force is appropriate. Conversely, military coercion, while still short of brute force, encompasses more compelling approaches. It involves restricting the adversary's choices, rather than just inducing them. This has consequences for whether the coercer's strategy should be formulated in terms of punishment, risk, denial, decapitation, or incapacitation.

Theoretically, coercive diplomacy is often associated with punishment and risk approaches. Escalation dominance and massive force, on the other hand, is of less importance for coercive diplomacy than for military coercion, because the use of force is meant to demonstrate, not overpower or deny (de Wijk 2005: 258). Nevertheless, empirically, denial approaches have been among the most common in Western attempts at coercive diplomacy (de Wijk 2005: 116). This is especially true of NATO's engagements in the Balkans, where the targeting of fielded forces constituted a central feature of Alliance strategy. To most observers it was clear that the conflict in Bosnia had no military solution, and would rather have to be settled politically. Although the military situation often dictates the possibilities and execution of political negotiations, it nevertheless seems artificial that most of the threatened or actual NATO airstrikes were designed to provide tactical support on the battlefield. This is more typical of military coercion and denial, and since it was used to support a coercive diplomatic initiative, the strategy was poorly matched with its objectives. Thus it can be argued that the strikes should not have been designed to win militarily, but rather to generate political conditions conducive to negotiations (Henriksen 2007: 56). This situation was somewhat bettered with the federation ground campaign. Now the possibility of losing militarily probably suggested itself to Bosnian Serb leadership, finally making NATO's strategy pay off.

To some extent, a similar argument holds true also for the Kosovo conflict. This time NATO's airstrikes had been explicitly designed for coercive diplomatic purposes, and OAF, having learnt from the Bosnian experience, better reflected the requirements of punishment and risk approaches, with incremental, serial bombing. The problem however, was that as OAF commenced, negotiations were discontinued for a time. NATO's air campaign thus remained designed for coercive diplomacy, meanwhile the Alliance simultaneously moved away from coercive diplomacy and towards military coercion. With such a mismatch in NATO's objectives and strategies, the Serbian government retained the initiative and was able to find effective ways of negating the damage caused by the bombing (de Wijk 2005: 103; Henriksen 2007: 44). Additionally, while coercive diplomacy could rely on the limited use of air power, military coercion would require a significant ground presence which could overpower Serbia militarily (Burg 2003: 107-108). Because such a deployment remained problematic, the conflict could only be resolved once NATO moved back towards coercive diplomacy, by both reintroducing negotiations and redirecting their airstrikes towards more strategic targets.

In general, these observations are illustrative of a tendency among Western policy-makers and military planners; that once military force is required, its primary measure of merit is its ability to deny the adversary his objectives. This view can derive from typical Western military doctrines, which revolve around fighting conventional wars, with standoff weaponry, to win decisive battles with shock and awe. Apart from denial, such strategies might also work well with decapitation or incapacitation approaches. But when this mindset has been brought into post-modern limited, warfare, the results have often been detrimental, not least because a limited use of force can rarely produce more than limited denial (de Wijk 2005: 21).

Another reason for mismatching objectives and strategies can perhaps be that while the aims and objectives of NATO governments often correspond to coercive diplomacy, the approaches associated with the strategy are both politically and inherently difficult (Art 2003: 363). First of all, punishment strategies are often quite controversial, as they involve inflicting pain on the civilian population. In contrast, targeting fielded military forces for denial purposes is considered more legitimate. Another problem is the limited nature of coercive diplomacy; the threatened, future punishment can simply not be significant enough as to cause a change in behavior. Next, also in risk approaches the challenges are significant. Firstly, the strategy loses efficiency because pain suffered today often counts for more than threatened pain tomorrow; this is known as hyperbolic discounting. Furthermore, by escalating over

time, the adversary has more time to adapt to the situation, or create a buffer of domestic support. Summing up, Robert Art (2003: 364-365) has concluded that given the many challenges associated with coercive diplomatic strategies, risk approaches hold the highest chances of success. Although also these have weaknesses, they are the easiest to achieve with limited means. This is especially true because gradualism, often a political requirement in NATO countries, is not as harmful for this type of approach. Risk approaches are based on the threat of future loss, and gradualism ensures that the adversary will still have valuable targets to hold at ransom in the future.

It is a strategic paradox that certain contemporary developments in politics and military doctrines induce NATO governments towards gradualism and denial. This combination can be detrimental for exerting influence through limited military means, as limited force brings only limited, and thus ineffective, denial. Conversely, denial, as well as decapitation and probably incapacitation, should be sought in concert with traditional strategies of military coercion and shock and awe. Coercive diplomacy however, works best with gradual risk-approaches, perhaps also with elements of punishment where this is feasible and politically acceptable.

6.5 Explaining Coercive Diplomacy

The aim of this thesis has been to explain the variance in the outcomes of NATO and its member governments' attempts at using the strategy of coercive diplomacy as a crisis management tool. With the advent of risk management, "optional" wars, and coalitional warfare, the NATO countries have been in need of improved ways to use its military strength to exert influence in the post-modern security environment. They are required, in General Clark's (2001) terminology, to wage "modern war". Coercion has thus come to be one of the primary ways in which contemporary, liberal democracies use force today, and using coercion to attempt returning to the *status quo* by ending and/or reversing the actions of a voluntary actor is what is known as coercive diplomacy.

As opposed to strategies primarily linked to the Cold War era, like deterrence, coercive diplomacy has not attracted much scientific attention. As a result, several notable researchers have identified a lacuna in the theorizing of the subject. As identified in this thesis, perhaps one of the most urgent challenges has been a relative under-theorization of the adversary. The subject-area has been in need of a *dynamic* theory, which sees the adversary as a meaningful

unit of analysis, and accounts for its motivations and interests. In this respect, the theoretical framework developed by Jentleson and Whytock is a significant step in the right direction. To test their framework's feasibility for explaining NATO's attempts at coercive diplomacy, the thesis identified two major cases as the range of potential research objects, namely the 1992-1995 NATO intervention in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the 1998-1999 intervention in Kosovo. Including both cases helped secure the study's robustness, representivity, and potential for generalization. The theoretical variables were then operationalized and dichotomized, in order to be congruence tested against twelve sub-cases derived from the two main cases.

Having concluded this test, I can now answer the study's two-part research question. To begin with its theoretical dimension, because the degree of congruence has been shown to be between 75% and 90%, it is fair to say that the variance in the outcomes of NATO's attempts at coercive diplomacy can, to a significant degree, be explained by the theoretical framework presented here. First of all, this means that positive outcomes can be expected when the coercer's strategy implements coercive measures proportional to a set of clear and limited demands made against the coerced. Typically, this means that regime change, or demands that dramatically threaten a ruling regime's safety, are not advisable. Furthermore, there should be an explicit or tacit link between the adversary's concession and a set of limited, positive inducements offered by the coercer. Such inducements must also be proportionate, and cannot be offered too soon or too late. Finally, the threats made have to be credible, meaning that the coerced must believe that the threatened, negative consequences will follow noncompliance. Secondly, a coercive diplomatic attempt must also satisfy a set of domestic conditions. The threat should be designed so that it at least does not significantly threaten the target regime's political support or safety. Next, the threat must promise the coerced a more beneficial economic result for compliance than for noncompliance. Finally, the threat should be designed so that it does not encroach on the interests of the target state's key actors and elites. Conversely, should their interests be best served by complying with the external demands, this increases the threat's chances of success.

In light of the study's research design, I have concluded that it is likely that the variables outlined above are part of a causal mechanism. To some extent, this claim finds support in other studies of coercive diplomacy. Next, having largely succeeded in adequately explaining the two examined cases, it can be argued that the framework developed by Jentleson and Whytock has passed a least-likely "tough test". As the two cases in some ways were at the

margins of what this relatively new theory could be expected to account for, its research status has been clearly strengthened.

The empirical, disciplined configurative dimension of the research question asked for heuristic knowledge about the examined cases. Firstly, such insight should generally be reflected throughout chapters three and four. Secondly, in these two cases, NATO demonstrated up to a 50% coercive diplomacy success rate. This is a higher degree of success than found in other, more general studies of coercive diplomacy. Although it is not entirely clear why this should be the case, it is an optimistic observation in terms of NATO's future capability for dealing with breaches to the international order.

Next, some correlation was observed between two variable dyads. In practice, this means that policy-makers can expect mutual dependencies within these pairs. Firstly, proportionality seems linked with internal political support and security, implying that an important factor in determining appropriate proportions between coercive instruments and objectives is the effect the threat has on the target regime's survivability. Next, internal political support is connected to the role of elites and key actors. This illustrates how the ruling regime's survivability to a large degree is dependent on the actions of the key actors surrounding it. Seen together, these observations can indicate it is better to threaten a foreign government not directly, but indirectly, through influencing key actors.

As a fourth point, the study found no sufficient conditions for a positive outcome, but found that all but one of the variables were necessary. Reciprocity, as the final variable, was not found necessary in a strict sense; a conclusion with some support in other studies as well. Nevertheless, its often greatly facilitating role means policy-makers should reconsider before excluding it from future coercive diplomatic attempts. As for the relative difficulty of satisfying the various conditions, reciprocity and internal political support were secured the fewest times. The difficulties with the first of these need not be problematic, as it probably is not necessary in a strict sense. The second however, underlines the significant challenges of designing a threat that both exerts pressure while it does not threaten the ruling regime's survivability. On this point, it should be noted that the contemporary trend towards indicting leaders of the target state is likely to reduce NATO's ability to influence the coerced's policies. A final observation was unsurprisingly that coercive economic instruments proved the easiest for the NATO governments to master.

On a related note, a certain primacy of the domestic variables over the coercer's strategy has been observed. This can imply that using coercive diplomacy as a "default" response to international crises is especially unfortunate, because the most important factors in determining its successfulness lies outside the policy-makers control. Instead, when to use the strategy should be a situational decision, as the strategy is likely to succeed only in situations with conducive domestic conditions in the target state. Hence it can be argued that NATO's successes in Bosnia and Kosovo was in part the result of a number of predominantly domestic conditions, which took time to mature and come into effect.

Finally, it was concluded that to some extent, contemporary political and military developments draw NATO towards gradually escalating coercive means, often to the purpose of denying the adversary his objective. The paradox is that gradualism and denial is a potentially harmful combination, as limited and gradual use of force can only produce limited, and thus ineffective, denial. Instead, coercive diplomacy should be based on risk approaches, with elements of punishment where feasible. These approaches are easier to achieve with only limited military means, while gradualism is not problematic. Conversely, the typical doctrine of shock and awe is better suited for military coercion. Taking this into account, it can be argued that NATO's choice of objectives and strategies in the two conflicts were not perfectly aligned.

The findings for both the theoretical and the empirical questions should be generalizable to the population from whence the examined cases were drawn. Although there were no other historical cases available when this thesis was designed, the results can be expected to be valid for a hypothetical universe of potential, similar research objects. In other words, the inferences made will likely be correct also for future incidents that closely resemble those examined here. Such incidents include NATO and its member governments' attempts at using coercive diplomacy as a crisis management tool in third-party conflicts.

6.6 Final Remarks

Having answered the research question, only some final remarks remain to be made. This thesis has presented and tested an alternative approach, rethinking the strategy of coercive diplomacy. Emphasis has been put on its *dynamic* nature, in order to address a gap in the subject area's research literature. This section will attempt to tie up loose ends, summarize the

study's strengths and challenges, and shortly compare and contrast the study to the area's broader research.

Firstly, some strengths of the research design should be noted. The theoretical framework, as developed by Jentleson and Whytock, represents a model of coercive diplomacy which allows for more realistic theorizing about not only the coercer's strategy, but the adversary's motivations and interests as well. As such, some assumptions commonly made about the coerced were no longer required, entailing that the theory could adequately explain the subject-matter with fewer assumptions than other, concurrent theories. Furthermore, with an explanatory power between 75% and 90%, it can be said to explain at least as much as other models of coercive diplomacy. This implies that future research on coercive diplomacy should continue the work into understanding the adversary.

Next, it has been argued that denial is not the best approach for coercive diplomacy, whereas risk and punishment are more appropriate. Nevertheless, even the formulation of a theoretical model can emphasize certain approaches over others. For example, Jakobsen's (2007: 231) theory identifies "*...defeat the opponent or deny him his objectives...*" as a central requirement of coercive diplomacy. This indicates a certain bias towards denial, and rules out a number of non-military, coercive means. On the other hand, Jentleson and Whytock's model explicitly accounts for risk instruments like economic sanctions, as well as punishment factors such as regime survivability.

This study has attempted to provide transparency in its methodological decisions for improving replicability. Additionally, as a comparative case-study with both within-case and cross-case components, it is also fair to say that the thesis enjoys high levels of validity, meanwhile a triangulation of primary sources, guided by secondary literature, secured adequate reliability. On the other hand, the study's potential for generalization is low, especially as at the time of designing the thesis, there were no other historical cases in the universe of research objects. Nevertheless, some contingent generalization to a hypothetical universe of potential, future research objects is warranted. The findings are externally valid not through statistical representation, but through an increased theoretical understanding provided by an interaction between the theoretical model and the examined cases (Bratberg 2009). This allowed for drawing some conclusions which should be considered the next time NATO decision-makers consider using coercive diplomacy.

While this thesis mainly focused on congruence testing the specified theory, a more elaborate process-tracing approach would have helped ensure the findings' robustness, as well as aided in determining whether the observed covariation is due to an actual causal mechanism (George and Bennett 2005: 183). The need for such improvements is especially acute as the theory is relatively new and untested, and some of its elements have less support in existing literature. Furthermore, a single congruence test is not enough to validate the theory, entailing that more testing is required. This can be done in other studies, perhaps with other cases, should they become available. Finally, the theory should be more systematically tested and evaluated against competing theories and models. These challenges should be considered in later studies.

In conclusion, it is clear that in order to maximize its chances of success, coercive diplomacy should be integrated as a part of a larger, long-term, political and military strategy (de Wijk 2005: 15). The greatest mistake policy-makers can commit is thinking that coercive diplomacy is a suitable "default" option for managing low-interest conflicts in the post-modern world. The strategy is by no means a "quick fix" for international security issues, but requires careful planning and coordination. A common source of critique against Operation Allied Force has been the 78 days it took to coerce the Serbs into compliance, and in contrast to the only three week long Deliberate Force, this is understandable. Nevertheless, this argument overlooks the importance of the coerced's dramatically different domestic conditions, to which the outcome of coercive diplomacy remains intimately connected. To the extent it will come to be considered as coercive diplomacy, this is evident in NATO's recently concluded Operation Unified Protector. The idea that limited military force is an easy and quick solution to third-party conflicts is discredited as NATO sums up its 222 day long engagement in Libya as a success.

Bibliography

- Art, Robert J. (2003). "Coercive Diplomacy: What Do We Know?", ch. 9 in Robert J. Art and Patrick M. Cronin (eds.). *The United States and Coercive Diplomacy*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- Aybet, Gülnur and Rebecca R. Moore (2010). "Introduction", p. 1-10 in Gülnur Aybet and Rebecca R. Moore (eds.). *NATO in Search of a Vision*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Baylis, John and James J. Wirtz (2007). "Introduction", p. 1-15 in John Baylis, James J. Wirtz, Colin S. Gray, and Eliot Cohen (eds.). *Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BBC (1995a): *The Death of Yugoslavia: Enter Nationalism*, September 3rd.
- BBC (1995b): *The Death of Yugoslavia: The Gates of Hell*, September 3rd.
- BBC (2003a): *The Fall of Milosevic: Defiance*, January 5th.
- BBC (2003b): *The Fall of Milosevic: Finished*, January 19th.
- BBC (2003c): *The Fall of Milosevic: War*, January 12th.
- Bratberg, Øivind (2009). Lecture in Research Methodology and Statistics, Institute of Political Science, University of Oslo. August 19th.
- Burg, Steven L. (2003). "Coercive Diplomacy in the Balkans: The U.S. Use of Force in Bosnia and Kosovo", ch. 3 in Robert J. Art and Patrick M. Cronin (eds.). *The United States and Coercive Diplomacy*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- Cigar, Norman (2001). "Serb War Effort and Termination of the War", ch. 9 in Branka Magaš and Ivo Žanić (eds.). *The War in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina 1991-1995*. London: Frank Cass.
- Clark, Wesley K. (2001). *Waging Modern War*. Oxford: PublicAffairs Ltd.
- Collins, Alan (ed.) (2007). *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- de Wijk, Rob (2005). *The Art of Military Coercion: Why the West's Military Superiority Scarcely Matters*. Amsterdam: Mets & Schilt.
- Everett, Euris Larry and Inger Furseth (2004). *Masteroppgaven: Hvordan begynne - og fullføre*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Freedman, Lawrence (2004). *Deterrence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- George, Alexander L. (1994). "Introduction: The Limits of Coercive Diplomacy", p. 1-4 in Alexander L. George and William E. Simons (eds.). *The Limits of Coercive Diplomacy*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- George, Alexander L. (2003). "Foreword", p. vii-xiii in Robert J. Art and Patrick M. Cronin (eds.). *The United States and Coercive Diplomacy*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace.

- George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- George, Alexander L. and William E. Simons (eds.) (1994). *The Limits of Coercive Diplomacy*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Henriksen, Dag (2007). *NATO's Gamble: Combining Diplomacy and Airpower in the Kosovo Crisis 1998-1999*. Annapolis: Naval Institute Press.
- Holbrooke, Richard (1998). *To End a War*. New York: Random House.
- Hovi, Jon (2007). "Trusler i internasjonal politikk", ch. 3 in Jon Hovi and Raino Malnes (eds.). *Anarki, makt og normer: Innføring i internasjonal politikk*. Oslo: Abstrakt forlag AS.
- Hyde-Price, Adrian (2004). "European Security, Strategic Culture, and the Use of Force", *European Security* 13: 323-343.
- IPU.org. "Serbia - Narodna skupstina (National Assembly)", *The Inter-Parliamentary Union's Historical Archive of Parliamentary Election Results*. <http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/reports/2355_arc.htm> [Date of access September 23rd 2011]
- Jackson, Richard (2007). "Regime Security", ch. 9 in Alan Collins (ed.). *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jakobsen, Peter Viggo (1998). *Western Use of Coercive Diplomacy after the Cold War: A Challenge for Theory and Practice*. Houndmills: Macmillan Press.
- Jakobsen, Peter Viggo (2007). "Coercive Diplomacy", ch. 13 in Alan Collins (ed.). *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jentleson, Bruce (2012). E-mail correspondence. March 4th.
- Jentleson, Bruce and Christopher A. Whytock (2005). "Who "Won" Libya? The Force-Diplomacy Debate and Its Implications for Theory and Policy", *International Security* 30: 67-86.
- Knutsen, Oddbjørn (2009). Lecture in Research Methodology and Statistics, Institute of Political Science, University of Oslo. September 30th.
- Lambseth, Benjamin S. (2001). *NATO's AirWar for Kosovo: A Strategic and Operational Assessment*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Magaš, Branka and Ivo Žanić eds. (2001). *The War in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina 1991-1995*. London: Frank Cass.
- Matlary, Janne Haaland. *Når russerne spiller sjakk, hva spiller Vesten?*
<<http://www.minervanett.no/2008/09/29/nar-russerne-spiller-sjakk-hva-spiller-vesten/>> [Date of access February 29th 2012]
- Matlary, Janne Haaland (2009). *European Union Security Dynamics: In the New National Interest*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Matlary, Janne Haaland (2012). Personal communication. January 31st.

- Morris, Justin (2007). "Law, Politics, and the Use of Force", ch. 5 in John Baylis, James J. Wirtz, Colin S. Gray, and Eliot Cohen (eds.). *Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- NATO.int (1992). *Statement on NATO Maritime Operations (1). 10 Jul.*
http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-51B0EA64-26B66FA7/natolive/official_texts_23980.htm [Date of access September 19th 2011]
- NATO.int (1993a). *NATO starts operation of no-fly zone enforcement. 12 Apr.*
http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_24089.htm [Date of access September 28th 2011]
- NATO.int (1993b). *Press Statement by the Secretary General Following the Special Meeting of the North Atlantic Council 02 Aug.* http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-344A3D64-E2C694D6/natolive/official_texts_24147.htm [Date of access September 25th 2011]
- NATO.int (1993c). *Decisions taken at the meeting of the North Atlantic Council on 9th August.* http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-344A3D64-E2C694D6/natolive/official_texts_24145.htm [Date of access September 25th 2011]
- NATO.int (1994a). *Decisions taken at the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Permanent Session 1. 09 Feb.* http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-C2998801-C6DC7357/natolive/official_texts_24465.htm [Date of access September 27th 2011]
- NATO.int (1994b). *Decisions on the protection of safe areas taken at the meeting of the North Atlantic Council. 22 Apr.* http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-A9043004-1CBB61D8/natolive/official_texts_24462.htm [Date of access September 27th 2011]
- NATO.int (1994c). *The North Atlantic Council takes further decisions regarding the use of air power to protect UN personnel. 22 Apr.*
http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_24367.htm [Date of access September 28th 2011]
- NATO.int (1994d). *NATO aircraft provide close air support to UN personnel in Gorazde. 10 Apr.* http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_24369.htm [Date of access September 28th 2011]
- NATO.int (1994e). *UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali requests NATO to prepare for possible air strikes. 06 Feb.*
http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_24406.htm [Date of access September 28th 2011]
- NATO.int (1994f). *Decisions taken at the meeting of the North Atlantic Council. 22 Apr.*
http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-A9043004-1CBB61D8/natolive/official_texts_24461.htm [Date of access September 27th 2011]
- NATO.int (1995a). *Bosnians Serbs Sign Agreement on Heavy Weapons Withdrawal. 14 Sep.*
http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_24593.htm [Date of access September 29th 2011]

- NATO.int (1995b). *NATO aircraft resumed attacks on Bosnian-Serb military targets. 05 Sep.* <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_24597.htm> [Date of access September 29th 2011]
- NATO.int (1995c). *Statement by the Secretary General Following Council Meeting - 2 September.* <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_24736.htm> [Date of access September 29th 2011]
- NATO.int (1995d). *NATO aircraft resume bombing of Bosnian Serb positions. 01 Sep.* <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_24599.htm> [Date of access September 29th 2011]
- NATO.int (1998). *Statement on Kosovo Issued at the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held in Luxembourg on 28th May 1998.* <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-D1E4AEDE-CDDC820A/natolive/official_texts_25976.htm> [Date of access September 6th 2011]
- NATO.int (1999). *Statement by the North Atlantic Council on Kosovo. 30 Jan.* <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-EAC159E0-0D17C0C3/natolive/official_texts_27459.htm> [Date of access September 10th 2011]
- Owen, David (1995). *Balkan Odyssey*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Owen, David (1996). *Balkan Odyssey*. London: Indigo.
- Schelling, Thomas C. (1976). *Arms and Influence*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Skogan, John Kristen (2007). "Sikkerhetspolitiske mål og virkemidler", ch. 5 in Jon Hovi and Raino Malnes (eds.). *Anarki, makt og normer: Innføring i internasjonal politikk*. Oslo: Abstrakt forlag AS.
- Switzer, Warren H. (2001). "International Military Responses to the Balkan Wars: crises in analysis", ch. 11 in Branka Magaš and Ivo Žanić (eds.). *The War in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina 1991-1995*. London: Frank Cass.
- The New York Times* (1992a). "Bosnia Calls Up Guard and Reserve", article by Chuck Sudetic, April 5th.
- The New York Times* (1992b). "Conflict in the Balkans; Serbia's Enigma: An Aloof Leader Who Stoked Fires of Nationalist Passion", article by John F. Burns, December 22nd.
- The New York Times* (1992c). "Serbs Back a UN Relief Force, but Warn against Foreign Army", article by Chuck Sudetic, August 12th.
- The New York Times* (1992d). "Yugoslavs Face Hard Winter as the Blockade Bites", article by Paul Lewis, October 29th.
- The New York Times* (1993a). "Conflict in the Balkans; Nationalist Serbs Say They Will Ease Siege of Sarajevo", article by John F. Burns, August 6th.
- The New York Times* (1993b). "Serb in New Offer to U.N. to Quit Sarajevo Positions", article by John F. Burns, August 9th.

- The New York Times* (1993c). "A Siege by Any Other Name Would Be as Painful", article by John F. Burns, August 17th.
- The New York Times* (1995a). "Captives Free, U.N. Gives Up Effort to Shield Sarajevo", article by Roger Cohen, June 19th.
- The New York Times* (1995b). "Conflict in the Balkans: Bosnia; Fighting in Bosnia Flares over Posts Abandoned by U.N.", article by Roger Cohen, June 2nd.
- The New York Times* (1999a). "Crisis in the Balkans: News Analysis; Fruit of Miscalculation", article by Steven Erlanger, June 4th.
- The New York Times* (1999b). "Crisis in the Balkans: The Road to War - A Special Report; How a President, Distracted by Scandal, Entered Balkan War", article by Elaine Sciolino and Ethan Bronner, April 18th.
- The New York Times* (1999c). "Ethnic Albanian Guerrillas Will Attend Talks on Kosovo", article by Carlotta Gall, February 3rd.
- The New York Times* (1999d). "Kosovo Albanians, in Reversal, Say They Will Sign Peace Pact", article by Jane Perlez, February 24th.
- The New York Times* (2004). "Why Libya Gave Up on the Bomb", article by Flynt Leverett, January 23rd.
- UN.org. *National Accounts Main Aggregates Database*.
<<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/snaama/introduction.asp>> [Date of access September 19th 2011]
- Underdal, Arild (2008). Lecture in International Politics, Institute of Political Science, University of Oslo. August 20th.
- UNSCR 713 (1991). *Resolution 713 (1991) of 25 September*. United Nations Security Council.
- UNSCR 836 (1993). *Resolution 836 (1993) of 4 June*. United Nations Security Council.
- Williams, Paul (2001). "The International Community's Response to the Crisis in Former Yugoslavia", ch. 10 in Branka Magaš and Ivo Žanić (eds.). *The War in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina 1991-1995*. London: Frank Cass.
- Williams, Phil (2007). "Strategy for a New World: Combating Terrorism and Transnational Organized Crime", ch. 9 in John Baylis, James J. Wirtz, Colin S. Gray, and Eliot Cohen (eds.). *Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yin, Robert K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. London: Sage.